In an effort towards continuous improvement, the Accreditation Steering Committee is asking all campus committees to complete this form.

Committee Name: Curriculum  
Adopted Date: October 20, 2015

**STEP 1:** Fill out the chart below by reflecting upon the 2014-2015 academic year activities of the committee (looking backwards) and future activities (looking forward).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Looking Backward</th>
<th>Struggles of 2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accomplishments/Successes for 2014-2015</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing problems with the LACCD course management system (ECD) including the system frequently going offline, the ongoing inability to directly submit via the ECD system reinstatement of archived course requests to the District Office, and an ongoing issue with directly submitting course change requests via the ECD system to the District Office. It should be noted that the focus of District IT is the implementation of a new course management system (CurricUNET) scheduled for the start of the 2016-17 academic year so repair, maintenance, and service of the existing ECD system have been deprioritized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee reviewed a total of 688 items on technical review, revised outline, or curriculum agenda in 2014-15, of which 456 items were presented for final approval, and, of that number, 381 were approved by the committee (82.67%). This total includes: 9 new degrees, 3 new Certificates of Achievement, 12 new Skills Certificates, 9 courses new to the district, 49 additions of district courses new to ELAC, 11 course reinstatements (a total of 69 new courses to ELAC overall), 33 course changes, 17 new distance education proposals, 6 new honors proposals, 13 degree changes, 15 certificate changes, 193 revised course outlines and 4 revised and updated Distance Education Addenda. This workload was down slightly from 2013-14, when the committee reviewed a total of 719 items on various technical review, revised outline, or curriculum agenda, of which 470 items were presented for final approval, and, of that number, 377 were approved by the committee (80.21%), largely due to a large number of DE Addenda revisions to comply with the initial April 2014 Curriculum Committee-proposed and Academic Senate-adopted DE Addenda revision deadline (first approved 10/26/13) to insure the addenda provided adequate evidence of regarding “instructor-initiated instructor-student contact and interaction” in courses employing DE and hybrid modalities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee supported the work of discipline faculty to ensure that ELAC was in full compliance with the mandate of SB 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing issues with the inefficiencies in having submitted course outlines of record reviewed by the state C-ID reviewers often delays submittal of ADT degree proposals to the State Chancellor’s Office. It should be noted that this seems to be a state-wide issue as many curriculum chairs have noted similar concerns at the State Curriculum Listserv, maintained by the ASCCC. |

Changes in District and State policies are often initiated with little notice given to local campuses causing an increased workload for the committee as well as affected discipline faculty. |

Ongoing issues with the LACCD course management system (ECD) including the system frequently going offline, the ongoing inability to directly submit via the ECD system reinstatement of archived course requests to the District Office, and an ongoing issue with directly submitting course change requests via the ECD system to the District Office. It should be noted that the focus of District IT is the implementation of a new course management system (CurricUNET) scheduled for the start of the 2016-17 academic year so repair, maintenance, and service of the existing ECD system have been deprioritized. |

The committee continues to have workload crunches surrounding deadlines established for outline updates, e.g. recency updates must be approved by Curriculum prior to November 1 each year, along with other deadlines established by Senate policy as need arises as well as those deadlines established by State Chancellors Office policy and/or LACCD policy often with little advance notice, as some departments wait until very near the established deadlines despite updates regarding status of courses and programs being provided monthly at the Department Chairs meeting as well as by email to each department chair and updates from members of the committee to departments within their clusters. |

Ongoing issues with the inefficiencies in having submitted course outlines of record reviewed by the state C-ID reviewers often delays submittal of ADT degree proposals to the State Chancellor’s Office. It should be noted that this seems to be a state-wide issue as many curriculum chairs have noted similar concerns at the State Curriculum Listserv, maintained by the ASCCC.
regarding the adoption of ADT Degree programs in all cases where an existing ELAC degree program exists, as measured by programs which have the same TOP Code, per State Chancellor’s Office policy.

The committee supported the work of discipline faculty to ensure that ELAC met a 100% standard regarding planning for ADT Degree offerings by the State Chancellor’s Office-mandated deadline.

The committee continued to enforce the Curriculum Committee-proposed and Academic Senate-adopted policy regarding recency for submitted Advisory Committee Minutes and Regional Consortium approvals regarding Certificate of Achievement and locally-approved Skills Certificate proposals, defining recency as “within one calendar year” so as to better ensure applicability and viability of such proposals and their connection to the college mission and departmental program review.

The committee continued to enforce the Curriculum Committee-proposed and Academic Senate-adopted policy that all new locally-approved Skills Certificate proposals require Advisory Committee Minutes and Labor Market data or other evidence of the viability of the utility of the locally-approved Skills Certificate proposal, employing the definition of recency as “within one calendar year” per Senate-adopted policy, so as to better ensure applicability and viability of such proposals and their connection to the college mission and departmental program review.

The committee continued to enforce the Curriculum Committee-proposed and Academic Senate-adopted policy defining recency for review of existing Certificates of Achievement as well as existing locally-approved Skills Certificates requiring updated Advisory Committee Minutes and Labor Market Data reaffirming the continued viability of such Certificates of Achievement and locally-approved Skills Certificates, defining recency as “within two calendar years” regarding such Certificates of Achievement and locally-approved Skills Certificates per Title 5 requirements, while applying the adopted “within one calendar year” definition of recency regarding Advisory Committee Minutes to this review policy so as to better ensure continued applicability and continued viability of such programs and their connection to the college mission and departmental program review.

The committee created a form so that departments wishing to archive a State-approved or locally-approved program may do

Ongoing issues with the inefficiencies in submitting course proposals as well as degree/program proposals to the District Office for Board approval which are exacerbated by the Board failing to consider proposals more than once a month are an ongoing challenge to process proposals in a timely manner.

Ongoing challenges in coordinating curriculum policies within a 9-college district covering a vast geographic area with vastly distinct student populations when changes to the district-attribute of a course at one campus must be approved by all nine colleges.

An ongoing challenge is that more work is required of the Classified Curriculum Secretary than can be reasonably completed in the time allotted to the position. During deadline crunch times, this issue holds true for the position and workload of the committee chair and campus Articulation Officer as well.

An ongoing lack of a dedicated computer or office space within the Academic Affairs building with regular convenient access for the committee chair to the curriculum secretary, which has now been ongoing since a verbal promise to create such a space was made to the Curriculum Chair by the CIO in 2013 continues to create unnecessary inefficiencies in time management while working on committee business and issues on campus, including checking edits from technical review to course outlines, various addenda, and program submissions when State revisions are requested by the Chancellor’s Office, among other scenarios.

The C-ID review system no longer informs campuses as to the status of course outline submissions, leaving the campus to attempt to discover on their own whether submissions have been approved, conditionally approved requiring revisions, or rejected by the C-ID reviewer, which creates inefficiencies in both gathering this information as well as disseminating it to the appropriate discipline faculty for timely action.

Ongoing delays in obtaining final Board approval of the pending revision to BR 6200 which will establish a single 21 unit LACCD GE pattern for all degrees when adopted – a change from formerly locally-approved LACCD Plan A (30 unit GE) and LACCD Plan B (18 unit GE) options has stopped the Committee from assisting affected departments in adjusting their degree patterns which currently use either the existing LACCD Plan A or LACCD Plan B LACCD GE patterns. This affects 33 distinct degrees at ELAC. This delay, which was not resolved until August 2015, will also shorten the timeline for both affected departments as well as the Curriculum Committee in making such adjustments prior to the publication of the 2016-17 College Catalog and start of the next academic year in August 2016.
so, with further review to be conducted by the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC). The committee forwarded the form to the Academic Senate which approved and adopted the form as the official form for disciplines and departments to initiate this process.

The committee maintained an ongoing review of prerequisites and corequisites as required by Title 5 regulations through its extant technical review and outline update processes.

The committee maintained an ongoing review of placing courses within LACCD-defined “families” of courses as regards restrictions on course offerings as required by State Chancellors’ office policy.

The committee continued to enforce the standing ELAC Academic Senate policy that no course outline of record whether a new course proposal or update or change to an existing course can be placed on the curriculum agenda without concurrent submission of department-approved Course Learning Outcome(s) addenda.

The committee continued to enjoy the support of the ELAC Academic Senate in maintaining the Course Outline Update Recency Policy with a November 1, 2014 deadline for course updates to be approved by the committee. In 2014-15, this resulted in no courses being archived for violation of the policy for the second consecutive academic year as a culture of compliance had been established regarding curriculum and the actions of the committee by the actions of the initial enforcement of the policy 2012-13, when 46 courses had been archived for failing to comply with the initial application of the Course Outline Update Recency Policy.

The committee supported a recommendation by the campus Articulation Officer and proposed to the Academic Senate a Program Submission Deadline policy regarding the submission and approval of new programs that require State Chancellor’s Office approval which would require final Academic Senate approval no later than the final Senate meeting in March of a given year for publication in the subsequent academic year’s Catalog, to better facilitate timely publication of the ELAC Catalog. ADT program proposals would be exempt from this deadline due to their expedited approval process.
at the District and at the State. The committee forwarded the policy proposal to the Academic Senate which approved the policy commencing in 2014-15.

The committee continued to enforce the standing ELAC Academic Senate policy of requiring detailed representative examples of assignments that demonstrate critical thinking within each course outline of record, whether revisions of currently-offered courses or any new course proposal, which include specific examples of higher order Bloom’s Taxonomy within the assignment parameters as well as within the expectations of student requirements for assignment completion, to ensure that all courses offered at ELAC are of appropriate rigor, depth, and breadth, and are cognizant of synthesis learning and focused on student analysis and evaluation of course materials as determined by the discipline faculty as content experts as is their right under 10+1 rights within Title 5, rejecting any proposal which does not meet this standard established by the Curriculum Committee in concert with the Academic Senate. The committee works closely in partnership with the campus Articulation Officer in insuring courses maintain articulation agreements with four-year baccalaureate institutions for courses offered at ELAC as well as maintaining updated approval status with C-ID for all course outlines which require C-ID approval as part of an ADT Degree program.

The committee continued to enforce the standing ELAC Academic Senate policy of requiring a predominance of higher order Bloom’s Taxonomy skills within the course objectives of each course outline of record, whether revisions of currently-offered courses or any new course proposal. In doing so, the committee reaffirms its commitment, as charged by the ELAC Academic Senate to ensure that all courses offered at ELAC are of appropriate rigor, depth, and breadth, and are cognizant of synthesis learning and focused on student analysis and evaluation of course materials as determined by the discipline faculty as content experts as is their right under 10+1 rights within Title 5, rejecting any such course outline of record submitted which does not meet this standard established by the committee in concert with the ELAC Academic Senate. The committee works closely in partnership with the campus Articulation Officer in insuring courses maintain articulation agreements with four-year baccalaureate institutions for courses offered at ELAC as well as maintaining updated approval status with C-ID for all course outlines which require C-ID approval as part of an ADT Degree program.
The committee continued to enforce the standing ELAC Academic Senate policy of requiring all new Associates Degree program proposals, whether ADT or non-ADT proposals, as well as all new Certificate of Achievement proposals and locally-approved Skills Certificate Proposals to be approved for offering at ELAC are of appropriate rigor, depth, and breadth, and are cognizant of synthesis learning and focused on student analysis and evaluation of course materials for all courses within the degree and/or certificate program and that such programs contain proper course sequencing, time to completion, depth, breadth, rigor, and synthesis learning to best prepare students for transfer and/or other educational goals as determined by the discipline faculty as content experts as is their right under 10+1 rights within Title 5, rejecting any such program proposal submitted which does not meet this standard established by the committee in concert with the ELAC Academic Senate. The committee works closely in partnership with the campus Articulation Officer to help insure courses maintain articulation agreements with four-year baccalaureate institutions for both courses as well as degree and certification programs offered at ELAC as well as maintaining updated approval status with C-ID for all course outlines which require C-ID approval as part of an ADT degree program.

Working with the Articulation Officer, the chair and Committee created an ADT Degree in Elementary Education as required by SB 440 as the ADT degree is listed under the same TOP Code as the currently-existing AA degree in Liberal Studies which was created by the Curriculum Committee at the behest of the Academic Senate per State Chancellor’s policy in Spring 2007.

The Chair and Members of the committee, who are grouped in membership into academic clusters, assisted faculty in various departments in updating their course outlines of record as well as their Distance Education Addenda throughout the year.

The committee chair serves on eleven distinct campus governance committees, including Program Review and Viability (PRVC) and the Educational Planning Committees as well as the District Curriculum Committee wherein district curriculum policies are discussed and recommendations made to the District.
Academic Senate. In turn, proposed district policy changes and proposals are relayed back to the ELAC curriculum committee as well as the Academic Senate and, through that body, to the campus community. In addition, the Campus Articulation Officer serves as the Articulation Officer’s representative to the District Curriculum Committee as well. Various members of the committee also serve as department chairs and Learning Outcomes campus facilitators and Learning Outcomes department facilitators as well, sharing the perspective of the Learning Outcomes committee with the Curriculum Committee regarding course, program, and institutional learning outcomes.
### Moving Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals for Upcoming Academic Year 2015-2016</th>
<th>Obstacles for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing responsibilities assigned to the Curriculum Committee by the Academic Senate under Title 5, including but not limited to insuring that all courses offered at ELAC are of appropriate rigor, depth, and breadth, and are cognizant of synthesis learning and focused on student analysis and evaluation of course materials as determined by the discipline faculty as content experts as is their right under 10+1 rights within Title 5, insuring that all programs offered at ELAC are of appropriate rigor, depth, and breadth, have proper course sequencing, reasonable time to student completion, and are cognizant of synthesis learning as determined by the discipline faculty as content experts as is their right under 10+1 rights within Title 5, facilitating all applicable deadlines and policies regarding curriculum as directed by Academic Senate policies, assisting discipline faculty regarding curriculum, and any other tasks assigned it by the Academic Senate, including but not limited to the creation of policies and creation and/or modification of forms and addenda affecting curriculum.</td>
<td>See “Struggles of 2014-15” as most are systemic and ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuant to the standing tasks listed above, the committee will undergo a review and potential modification of the ELAC Honors Addenda, similar to the review and modification of the ELAC Distance Education Addenda completed in 2013-14 to help better insure that the addenda best reflects both the increased rigor required of honors sections as well as student-centered learning through instructor-initiated instructor-student contact and interaction. The committee determined to wait until 2015-16 to conduct this review, rather than doing so in 2014-15 when the Committee was made aware that the current Honors Director was retiring at the end of the 2014-15 academic year so the Committee could work on this revision with the new Honors Director who began her duties in Fall 2015.</td>
<td>In addition, it is anticipated that the switch to a different course management system by the LACCD (CurricuNet) will likely cause a number of issues associated with transitioning from a locally-based and maintained course management system to a different, more widely-used system, both from an interface standpoint as well as from a need to train committee members and the general faculty in the use of the new CurricuNet system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the standing tasks listed above, the Academic Senate has tasked the committee to conduct a review of ELAC’s General Education offerings, including the placement of specific courses within general education areas and initiating the creation of a general education philosophy statement for the campus, as assigned to Academic Senates under 10+1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the standing tasks listed above, now that final Board approval of the revision to BR 6200 which establishes a single 21 unit LACCD GE pattern for all degrees has been made official, the Committee will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
work with affected departments to adjust their degree patterns which currently use either the existing LACCD Plan A or LACCD Plan B LACCD GE patterns before the Senate-imposed end of December 2015 deadline for degree revisions. This deadline will affect 33 degrees across the campus and was originally proposed to the Academic Senate by the Curriculum Committee in September 2015 to ensure that not only degree changes would be completed in a timely manner for publication in the next 2016-17 ELAC Catalog, but also so that corrected and updated degree patterns can be entered in the new District data and management systems (CurricuNet and Degree Audit) being adopted for the first time with the 2016-17 academic year.

Pursuant to the responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee outlined above, the Committee will propose a policy to the Academic Senate parallel to the Course Outline Update Recency Policy noted above regarding Title 5-mandated 2-year recency reviews of established prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on CTE-TOP Coded courses with a deadline for such a review to be established in consultation with the Academic Senate. On October 20, 2015, such a policy to create a 2-year review of all CTE-TOP Coded courses with existing prerequisites, corequisites, and/or advisories with an initial deadline for affected courses of no later than March 1, 2016, deadline repeating annually, with course archival the result of failing to have affected courses reviewed and passed by the Curriculum Committee was supported unanimously by the Curriculum Committee and forwarded to the Academic Senate for final approval. On October 27, 2015, the Academic Senate approved the Curriculum Committee’s policy recommendation and established the above policy. 144 courses will be affected in the 2015-16 academic year by the March 1, 2016 deadline under this policy.

**STEP 2:** Please return the form to the Accreditation Faculty Chair electronically, dunsheba@elac.edu and post on your committee web site. Thank you much for your participation.