

Chairs and Deans and the Curriculum Launch

- Curriculum development should happen at the department and school level, not in the Curriculum Committee review process. Curriculum Committee members review all aspects of course and program proposals as a 10+1 area of faculty responsibility, but the CC depends on chairs and deans to provide certain checks and assurances. Picture the two roles: a chair's view might be seen as more internal and textual, and a dean's might be considered more external and contextual.

Department Chairs

- **Department chairs** should have a solid working understanding of the CC's calendar, the course/program/WEE/DEA TRACE checklists and crib notes, the Supporting Docs page, and the course & program expiration spreadsheets. Please use ccsf.edu/cc > **Guidance**. Chairs, please ask all outline writers to read the crib notes (and/or TRACE lists) prior to working on an outline. Of course, there is also the Curriculum Handbook, found under Guidance too.
- The outline modification process—starting w/ aggregate assessment—for a course or program nearing the end of its 6-year shelf-life begins 4.5-5 years after the active outline's approval date since the local and state approval process can add another two semesters. The modification of a course previously approved by the CC in fall 2020 will be okay through fall '26 since outlines have a 6-year shelf life. In order to avoid deactivation or gaps in active status, the modification should have CC approval by and no later than sp '27, as it will be on its last gasp. This means that the modification process (i.e., assessment, dialogue) should have begun by fall '24. Then there should be enough time to ensure that a well thought-out modification will begin by sp '25—with no gaps caused by the course expiring. **Do not cut it too close by starting the modification process during year 5. Try to start the update process—w/assessment—in year 4.5.**
- For launch approval, an **aggregate assessment should have been submitted in the 18 months prior to launching a modified course or program outline**. The data, reflection, analysis, and conversations shaping that report should inform the outline modification. This is a loop-closer, putting assessment into action! Allow time for the magic to happen. It's much better and more meaningful when departments take care of this as part of the modification process. It's a real drag when the CC Chair & SLO Coordinators have to chase folks down for not assessing launched courses and programs.
- **For courses**—scan for completeness, correct proposal type, correct effective semester (a year in advance), course #/name, units/hours, course justification (w/ GE listed, distinguishing new GE requests and hour/unit changes), course applicability accuracy (GE requests), catalog description clarity and style, SLO coverage & clarity, logical content, content details in assignments, distinction between asst and eval sections, SLO phrasing echoing in evaluations (criteria booster), clean GE mapping, rigor, specific min quals (disciplines) accuracy, consultation/overlap, codes, textbook currency and OER, weird formatting, removal of old approval date, student-centeredness, and cultural responsiveness
- **For degrees and certificates**—a useful catalog description, a manageable timeline, inclusion of new standardized AA/AS language in description, no historical courses in program blocks, clear headings, coherent outcomes and mapping, current [supporting documents](#) (incl CTE narratives that have year/semester course sequence), and close adherence to AD-T templates. No spring effective dates w/ program modifications. Scrutinize the # of units and amount of time!

Deans

- **School deans must also be aware of approval deadlines and should, primarily, focus on**
 - **Appropriateness to the Mission of CCSF and the CCC**
 - **Need** . . . Does the department have sufficient information to show that there is a need for the course or program? Harmful competition with an existing program at CCSF or another college? Does the course or program fit with program review and planning needs? Is programmatic and/or community need seen in the outline's justification?
 - **Adequate Resources** . . . Does CCSF have the necessary resources—funding, facilities, personnel—to offer the course or program? Are resources being put into an unproductive program? What would make it more productive?

Deans and Chairs Together

- Hours and Units: Deans check this primarily for concerns about scheduling and resources. (Are unit/hr changes made transparent in the justification section?)
- Consultation: Does content overlap within an outline require consultation with other departments?
- Discipline: Ensure that min quals are listed and accurate. (*Does the MQs dropdown need editing or more options?*)
- Codes and Notes: Are the ToP, CIP, and SAM codes correct for MIS reporting? Is it CTE? Any internal notes needed?
- Is what's marked in course applicability (GE) consistent w/ what's listed in the justification?
- When a brand new course or program is being created, should something be deactivated?
- When a course is modified, its attached addenda (DEA or Honors) should also be updated.