

Folsom Lake College

Curriculum Handbook

Edited Fall 2018

Table of Contents:

Part I: Committee Overview

- A. Objective
- B. Purpose
- C. Responsibilities
- D. Membership - including responsibilities of:
 - a. Committee Chair
 - b. Technical Review Chair
 - c. Administrator Liaison
 - d. Articulation Officer
 - e. Committee Member
- E. Subcommittees
 - a. Distance Education
 - b. Multicultural, General Education, and Baccalaureate
 - c. Prerequisite / Corequisite / Advisory
 - d. Program Review and Department Planning
 - e. Technical Review

Part II: Development of an Outline

- A. Title 5 Requirements
- B. Course Outline Components - including descriptions of SOCRATES Sections
 - a. Submission Information
 - b. Basic Course Information
 - i. Identifier
 - ii. Title
 - iii. Same As
 - iv. Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories
 - v. Hours
 - vi. Catalog Description
 - vii. Courses Embedded in Catalog Description
 - c. Learning Outcomes and Objectives
 - d. Course Topics
 - e. Instructional Delivery Modalities
 - f. Methods of Instruction and In-Class Activities
 - g. Typical Homework Assignments
 - h. Evaluation and Assessment Methods
 - i. Distance Education
 - j. List of Representative Textbooks

- k. Additional Course Information
 - i. Faculty Disciplines
 - ii. Short Title for Transcripts
 - iii. Type of Grading
 - iv. Times Taken for Credit
 - v. Enrollment Family
 - vi. Cross-listed Courses
 - vii. TOP Code
 - viii. SAM Code
 - l. Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory/Enrollment Limitation Justification
 - m. Relationship to College Programs
 - i. Need/Purpose for the Course
 - ii. Associate Degree Competency
 - iii. Ethnic/Multicultural Studies Requirement
 - iv. Associate Degree GE Pattern
 - v. Degrees and Certificates
 - vi. Prerequisite To
 - vii. Corequisite To
 - viii. Advisory To
 - ix. Embedded in Descriptions
 - n. Relationship to Transfer Institutions
 - o. Feasibility
 - i. Departmental Planning
 - ii. Folsom Lake College Impact
 - iii. Los Rios Impact
 - iv. Staffing
 - v. Facilities
 - vi. Equipment and Supplies
 - vii. Library
 - p. Digital Signatures
 - C. Independent Study (295/495) Courses
 - D. Work Experience (198/498) Courses
 - E. Experimental Offering (299/499) Courses
- Part III: Stages of the Curriculum Process
- A. Draft
 - B. Department Review
 - a. Signatures for Department Chairs/Contacts
 - b. Collaboration Requests
 - C. Tech Review
 - D. 1st Reading
 - E. 2nd Reading
 - F. Consent/FYI
 - G. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee
 - H. Board of Trustees

I. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

J. Catalog

Part IV: Program Approval

A. Certificates

- a. Certificates of Recognition: fewer than 8 units
- b. Certificates of Recognition: 8 to fewer than 16 units
- c. Certificates of Achievement

B. Degrees: AS, AA, AA-T, and AS-T

C. Program Goals

- a. Transfer
- b. Local
- c. Career Technical Education

D. Program Proposal Types

- a. Revisions
- b. Deletions
- c. New Programs

Part V: Timelines

Part VI: Articulation and Transfer

A. Local General Education Review

B. Transfer Credit to FLC

C. Transfer to CSU and UC

D. Other Resources

Appendices

A. Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories, and Enrollment Limitations

B. Distance Education Guidelines

C. Future Directions Document

D. Program Appraisal and Deletion Process

E. Course Appraisal and Deletion Process

F. Course Outline of Record with Citations

Part I: Committee Overview

A. Objective

To maintain responsibility for the development, review, renewal, and proposal of curriculum, including courses, programs, and curriculum-related policy.

B. Purpose

1. To provide guidance, advocacy, and oversight for Folsom Lake College's curriculum by ensuring that the curriculum is academically sound, comprehensive, and responsive to the evolving needs of our students and the community we serve. □
2. To maintain a commitment to the college mission, values, and goals, and to the principles of collegial contact with our colleagues across the Los Rios Community College District.
□

3. To forward proposals regarding academic and professional matters to the Academic Senate.

C. Responsibilities of the Committee

1. To assist in the development of educational courses and programs and grading policies in accordance with the philosophy, policies, and objectives of the department, the college, and the district.
2. To encourage creativity, flexibility, and innovation in curriculum development.
3. To provide leadership and training for all college personnel in all curricular issues.
4. To make proposals to the Academic Senate on all college concerns regarding curriculum and curriculum policies.
5. To review proposals for all new and revised credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit courses.
6. To review proposals for all new and revised programs.
7. To review proposals for deletion of courses/updates of courses (report on periodic review resulting in no changes to catalog data elements).
8. To review proposals for approval for distance education courses.
9. To review proposals for approval for and validation of Prerequisites and/or Co-requisites and/or Advisories on Recommended Preparation.
10. To review proposals for new or revised study abroad courses and programs.
11. To develop and implement policies for reviewing proposals for new, revised, or renewed high school course articulation agreements.
12. To review proposals for FLC graduation requirements and general education requirements for the AA and AS degrees, ADTs (Associate Degrees for Transfer), Certificates of Recognition, and Certificates of Achievement.
13. To assume responsibility for other academic and professional matters in curriculum as mutually agreed upon between Academic Senate President and the College President.
14. To ensure all committee actions comply with the standards set forth by the Education Code, Title 5, and accrediting bodies.
15. To assess and revise as necessary committee processes and plans on a cyclical basis.
16. To actively engage and contribute in collegial interactions with the District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC), for program and course approvals, deletions, and revisions, as well as coordinate shared thematic block requests, Distance Education updates, and Reading, Writing, and Math competency requests.
17. To communicate effectively with Program Review and Department Planning subcommittee about new program proposals, and obtain guidance in regards to new program development.
18. To assure that Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) pending approvals are conveyed effectively to faculty developers and assist in the articulation process.

D. Membership

Total number of members varies from fourteen (14) to twenty-one (21), including Faculty Chair and Administrative Liaison and representation from the following areas:

- A. Faculty (9-16)
 - a. Faculty Chair (1)

- b. Faculty (7-14) priority given to represent all Instructional Areas
 - c. Faculty Articulation Officer (1)
- B. Classified (2)
 - a. Office of Instruction (1)
 - b. Degree evaluator (1)
- C. Students (2)
- D. Administrative Liaison (1)

Membership: Roles and Responsibilities

a. Responsibilities of the Faculty Chair of Curriculum:

- Set the agenda for Curriculum Committee meetings and ensure that the agenda is distributed at least two academic days prior to the meeting.
- Conduct the committee meetings.
- Ensure faculty primacy in the Curriculum Committee decision-making process.
- Ensure accuracy of the minutes of the Curriculum Committee meetings.
- Follow-up with subcommittees to ensure that work is done in a timely manner.
- Set the calendar of committee meetings.
- Stay informed of curriculum standards including Title 5, the Program and Course Approval Handbook, intersegmental approval processes (e.g. C-ID and articulation), regional consortium requirements for CTE, and accreditation.
- Supervise the orientation of new members and the ongoing training of continuing members.
- Support area Curriculum Committee members by providing assistance to faculty originators.
- Provide training to the faculty as necessary or as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.
- Assure that committee functions take place smoothly including:
 - Technical review
 - Prerequisite review
 - Distance education review
 - General education review
 - Multicultural review
 - Library sign-off/Sister college sign off
 - Articulation
- Report regularly to the Academic Senate.
- Coordinate the annual update of curriculum policies and the curriculum handbook.
- Move curriculum items through the various stages of approval in SOCRATES.
- Review catalog drafts for concurrence with approved changes.
- Serve as a member of the FLC Academic Senate or Participatory Governance (PG) committees and advocate for curriculum matters.
- On appointment of the FLC Academic Senate president, serve on DCCC and appropriate subcommittees.
- Coordinate curriculum with the other LRCCD colleges.

- Ensure that course deletions and program changes are communicated to Counseling, Degree Audit, Evaluators, and Public Information Services Office (PISO) so that catalog changes are reflected accurately.

b. Responsibilities of the Technical Review Chair of Curriculum:

- In consultation with the curriculum chair, set the agenda for tech review committee meetings and ensure that the agenda is distributed at least two academic days prior to the meeting.
- Conduct the committee meetings.
- Ensure that curriculum proposals adhere to the FLC curriculum style guide.
- Follow-up with the distance education and prerequisite/corequisite/advisory subcommittees to ensure that work is done in a timely manner.
- Provide training to the faculty as necessary or as recommended by the tech review committee.
- Maintain records of courses reviewed in tech review, and forward courses that have completed the tech review process to the curriculum chair at least one week in advance of the Curriculum Committee meeting.
- In consultation with the curriculum chair, determine whether a curriculum proposal completes a full review or is forwarded as a Consent/FYI item.
- Review proposals for Independent Studies (495) Courses, and forward approved proposals to the appropriate area dean.

c. Responsibilities of the Administrative Liaison:

- Provide administrative/clerical support to the Curriculum Committee.
- Ensure that minutes are taken at each Curriculum Committee meeting and submitted to the curriculum chair within one week after the meeting.
- Ensure that curriculum proposals approved by all applicable bodies are recorded in the college catalog and updated in the college and Chancellor's Office files and/or database.
- Ensure that each section of each credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit course is taught by a qualified instructor in accordance with the disciplines list and with other specifications defined in the course outline of record.
- Ensure that each credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit course and program is approved by the Folsom Lake College Curriculum Committee.
- Ensure that each new course and program is approved by the Los Rios Community College District Board of Trustees as a college-level course meeting the needs of the students.
- For each credit and noncredit course that is not part of a state-approved program, ensure that the course is approved as required by Title 5 and the state Chancellor's office.
- Ensure that, when the Curriculum Committee approves prerequisites or corequisites for a credit course, they are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with Title 5 Section [55003](#).
- Ensure that each credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit course is properly cataloged in the SOCRATES database.
- Ensure that repeated enrollment is allowed only in accordance with provisions of FLC's course repetition policy and Title 5.

- Ensure that final grades, as determined by the instructor, are permanently recorded as an evaluation of student performance.
- Provide updates from the CCCCCO.

d. Responsibilities of the Articulation Officer (AO):

- Act as contact person and mediator between sister college AOs.
- Serve as liaison to the system level offices (CCCCCO, CSU, and UC).
- Serve on the Curriculum Committee and Tech Review Subcommittee.
- Maintain and communicate accurate information regarding GE Subcommittee Recommendations.
- Submit courses to C-ID and ASSIST.
- Stay well-informed and inform the Curriculum Committee on articulation issues.
- Review current articulation agreements with 4 year colleges and make course to course articulation requests where appropriate. Track progress of these requests.
- Provide timely follow-up to articulation requests from four-year colleges.
- Serve as an advocate for the faculty and campus academic programs.
- Serve as an advocate for other articulating institutions by conveying information and concerns about that institution's curriculum to the faculty.
- Serve as an advocate for the transfer student and seek to ease the transfer process.
- Monitor each stage of the articulation process and update SOCRATES as appropriate.
- Manage and update campus articulation data and information through the statewide ASSIST database.
- Manage and update campus articulation data and information through the statewide C-ID database.
- Disseminate current, accurate articulation data to appropriate departments, staff, students, and campuses.
- Maintain the FLC Articulation Webpage
- Report campus curricular changes when appropriate to two- and four-year colleges.
- Prepare and submit annual statewide reports to various segments of higher education including CSU Baccalaureate List, UC TCA, C-ID, CSU GE, and IGETC.
- Prepare a GE subcommittee report to the curriculum chair and note taker for each meeting.

e. Responsibilities of a Curriculum Committee member:

- Review assigned curriculum proposals prior to the curriculum meeting.
- Attend Curriculum Committee meetings regularly (only one unexcused absence is deemed acceptable per semester in order to earn the contracted Service to College hours).
- Read the following documents to become familiar with the roles of the Curriculum Committee:
 - The Folsom Lake College Curriculum Handbook
 - The Folsom Lake College Curriculum Style Guide
 - "The Course Outline of Record (COR) Handbook" prepared by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
(<http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Curriculum-paper.pdf>)

- Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) (http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/Credit/2017/PCAH6thEditionJuly_FINA_L.pdf)
- The Curriculum Committee: Role, Structure, Duties, and Standards of Good Practice (<http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Curriculum.pdf>)
- Assist faculty in the curriculum development and revision processes.
- Apply current subcommittee processes to curriculum proposals.

E. Subcommittees

Subcommittees have been created to focus on specific curriculum tasks. A subcommittee may be composed of committee members or non-members. The function of each subcommittee is to review, inform, and make recommendations where appropriate to the Curriculum Committee. As per the FLC College Governance Agreement, the Curriculum Committee has five standing subcommittees:

- Distance Education
- Multicultural, General Education, and Baccalaureate
- Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory
- Program Review and Department Planning
- Technical Review

a. The Distance Education (DE) Subcommittee reviews curriculum proposals with distance education modalities. The committee makes recommendations during the Tech Review process, and these recommendations are forwarded to the Tech Review chair who then forwards the feedback to the curriculum developer. The DE subcommittee provides guidance to faculty developers when adding or revising DE modalities to their courses. Members of this committee collaborate with their counterparts at sister colleges to coordinate policies relating to the review and approval of DE courses.

b. The Multicultural/General Education/Baccalaureate Subcommittee reviews FLC curriculum for inclusion on FLC's graduation requirements, for submission to the UC Office of the Chancellor for UC transferability, for submission to the UC and CSU system offices for inclusion on the CSU GE and IGETC patterns. The articulation officer tracks these requests. This committee also reviews petitions for the use of courses taken at other colleges for local GE areas, CSU GE and IGETC areas. When appropriate, the committee forwards student petitions to discipline faculty for recommendations, such as for competency requests.

c. The Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory Subcommittee reviews all courses that have a prerequisite, a corequisite, an advisory, and/or enrollment limitation and determines whether they are an appropriate and rational measure of a student's readiness to enter the course. This committee ensures that prerequisite validation is completed for each course, and makes recommendations to curriculum developers during Tech Review.

d. The Program Review and Department and Planning (PRDP) Subcommittee is responsible for facilitating annual department planning, and periodic program reviews. In consultation with the CTE dean, this subcommittee also facilitates biennial reviews of CTE programs.

e. The Technical Review Subcommittee is the primary contact committee for all proposal submissions. This subcommittee reviews each outline to ensure the proposal adheres to the college's local style guidelines, applies to local degrees (when appropriate), meets standards for articulation and/or career relevance, and complies with relevant laws. Outlines are not forwarded to the Curriculum Committee until they have cleared the technical review process.

Part II: Development of an Outline

In California Community Colleges, the [Education Code 70902](#) provides the legal framework for the Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee to make recommendations directly to the district governing board in the areas of curriculum and academic standards. Title 5 Section [55002](#) provides further interpretation of Education Code 70902, specifically there are requirements for developing curriculum, and standards for developing a Course Outline of Record. A Course Outline of Record (COR) is a comprehensive description, written for both internal and external audiences. Programs are groups of courses that lead to a degree or certificate. This part of the handbook describes the process by which curriculum is developed in SOCRATES and how curriculum proposals become legally approved.

Curriculum proposals may be initiated by a student, faculty, classified, management, or community member; however, the faculty members in a subject area or department in cooperation with the instructional dean and the vice president of instruction are primarily responsible for performing the functions required for curriculum development. The curriculum committee has final recommending authority to the Board of Trustees for approval. In some instances, the CCCC reviews and chapters programs.

Please note the following regarding the importance of course and program outlines:

- Faculty are both legally (by Title 5) and contractually (by [LRCFT union](#) contract) required to teach to the course outline of record.
- Four-year colleges and universities articulate courses with us based upon the official course outline of record.
- Accreditation standards require that we assess how well our students achieve the program learning outcomes and SLOs contained in the official program and course outlines.

A. Title 5 Requirements

References to [Title 5](#) of the California Code of Regulations are provided throughout this document. The complete and current text may be viewed at the California Office of Administrative Law website at: <http://www.oal.ca.gov/>. The complete text of all California

statutes, including the California Education Code (CEC), which supersedes Title 5 may be viewed [here](#).

The major section in Title 5 that addresses the requirements for the course outline is [55002](#), Standards and Criteria for Courses. The course outline also plays an important role in establishing prerequisites (particularly section [55003](#)), course and program approvals by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) (section [55000.5](#)) and in [distance learning](#).

The number of units must appear in the course outline. The division of hours among lecture and laboratory must be shown. In a 16 week semester, one lecture unit equals one lecture hour and at least two hours of work outside of class per week. One laboratory unit equals three hours of laboratory per week. Socrates automatically calculates the outside of class hours and total student work after the lecture and lab hours are input into a COR. Title 5 section [55002.5](#) defines the credit hour, also called the Carnegie unit. Los Rios Policy [P-7241](#) also specifies how units are awarded in accordance with the hours of student work. In all lecture courses, the course outline must demonstrate that students are required to study outside of class, in the form of readings, homework, or other assignments.

Prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories are based on a review of the course outline and other course materials. In the case of sequential courses within and across disciplines (such as MATH 400 for MATH 401), a list of prerequisite skills which serve as the basis for content review is to be included in the course outline. Indeed, it is one of the responsibilities of the curriculum committee to ascertain if prerequisite skills are needed for a course, especially skills in the areas of English and Mathematics.

A credit course is required to incorporate critical thinking ([55002\(a\)\(2\)\(F\)](#)) along with learning skills and a college-level vocabulary. The course outline demonstrates that these skills are at the college level ([55002\(a\)\(2\)\(G\)](#)) and an integral component of the course.

Title 5 subparagraph [55002\(a\)\(3\)](#) addresses the Course Outline of Record specifically, the required components are unit value, scope, objectives, and content. All instructors of a course must follow the objectives and course content. The outline must also give examples of assignments, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation.

Individual instructors are free to use different assignments and methodology as long as the types they use are equivalent (in covering course content and achieving student outcomes) to those illustrated in the course outline. Examples of required texts and other instructional materials must also be included. Unless specified in the course outline (which would require justification to the curriculum committee), not all instructors must use the same text.

The course outline should also be compliant with regulations on distance education. Section [55202](#) states that course quality in distance education courses is to be judged by the same standards as spelled out in Section 55002 above. Title 5 section [55206](#) requires a separate

approval for distance education. The course outline also indicates that instructor-initiated regular and effective contact occurs in courses with distance education modalities, it is up to the faculty to ensure that regular and effective contact occurs in each section taught via distance education.

B. Course Outline of Record (COR) Components

The following general components of a typical course outline of record for a credit course are intended to address the needs specified in Title 5, the FLC Curriculum Style Guide, CSU/GE and IGETC requirements, C-ID, and ACCJC accreditation standards. This model course outline format is not a "recipe for success." The fields below roughly follow LRCCD's SOCRATES online curriculum inventory where faculty initiate and edit curriculum proposals. All curriculum proposals depend on the experience, training, and dedication of classroom instructors to generate the quality instruction that should be reflected in the course outline.

This model is intended to convey the components of a course outline that will be expected when it is reviewed in the variety of venues described above. A COR should be a comprehensive template for a new hire to teach a class in accordance with the Department's agreed upon goals and objectives for each course.

For specific examples as to how the different sections are to be completed Appendix F has a Course Outline of Record extracted from Socrates. There are local stylistic concerns and citations from Title 5 and the 6th edition of the PCAH.

a. SUBMISSION INFORMATION -- In the Explanation section of the course outline, this field allows for faculty to provide an explanation of why the course is being proposed, or how it is being revised. If it is a new course, a brief explanation of how the course will fit into an existing program or replace an older course should be put here. Course deletions should explain how departmental planning and student needs were considered in the course deletion proposal. Course deletions should provide some details about the justification for the course deletion. These details are important because the district curriculum coordinating committee and the Board of Trustees may scrutinize course deletions. The Board reviews and approves new course proposals and course deletion proposals. The explanation sections are public record on Board agendas, thus clear, concise wording is encouraged.

If it is a normal revision, a statement such as: "This revision is intended to keep curriculum current within the normal 6 year revision cycle," combined with some short details about the revised items should be sufficient. It is prudent to list any regulatory changes such as C-ID alignment or industry standards changes recommended by an advisory board. Also, if prerequisites or corequisites are being added or removed, a quick explanation of why the prerequisite was added will aid the Curriculum Committee in understanding why certain parameters have been added or removed.

b. BASIC COURSE INFORMATION --

i. Identifier -- This field consists of the designator abbreviation (e.g. ACCT for Accounting) and the course number. Note that designators are not the same as

departments. Departments house (or oversee) designators. Courses numbered under 100 are remedial courses, and the units are not degree-applicable or transferable. Courses numbered from 100 to 299 are degree-applicable (they may meet local major or certificate requirements or they may serve as elective units for a local or CTE AA or AS degree), but are not transferable. Courses numbered 300 and above are degree-applicable and CSU transferable. See Articulation and Transfer below for more information about transferability of courses.

ii. Title -- The title appears in published documents, and should be descriptive about the course content.

iii. Same As -- This field is reserved for cross-listed courses, which differ only in their identifiers; all other aspects of cross-listed courses are the same. Cross-listed courses may be advertised in two different designators/departments. Faculty from more than one discipline may teach cross-listed courses. When cross-listed courses are reviewed and/or revised, they must go through the curriculum process simultaneously. Programs to which cross-listed courses are applicable should list all versions of the course to make the program requirements clear to students.

iv. Units -- Unit credit is awarded in accordance with the Carnegie Unit where one unit of credit is equal to three hours of student work. Fractional units may be awarded. Typically, half units are the smallest fraction awarded, but other Los Rios colleges have gone down to quarter units. It is also possible to award variable units so long as the topics are divided in such a way to specify the content of discrete portions of a such a course.

v. Prerequisites / Corequisites / Advisories -- Note, prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories are explained further in Appendix A. For those courses with prerequisites or corequisites, the course outline should list those skills without which the student would be highly unlikely to succeed. (Or, for advisories, state the skills with which the student's learning in the course would be enhanced.) The basis for these statements of skills is the professional judgment of the instructors in the discipline. It is encouraged to find three CSU or UC schools that require the same prerequisite for a similar course. A prerequisite can be justified based on content review, and either articulation evidence or a data comparison (validation study) of the exit skills from the prerequisite course. A faculty developer should also explain the justification for establishing a prerequisite or corequisite or advisory in the Explanation Section of a revision, as well.

vi. Hours -- Lecture hours (include lecture, discussion, and recitation courses) assume two hours of work outside of class for each hour of in-class work. Lab hours (include science labs, activity courses, clinical hours, and practica) assume three hours of in-class work and typically no homework except in certain disciplines where transfer institutions may require outside of class studying.

vii. Catalog Description -- The catalog description should clearly state the scope of the course, its level, and what kinds of student goals the course is designed to fulfill. The description appears in the College Catalog and Schedule of Classes, therefore the audience is broad. The description should be written to distinguish a course from similar courses in the catalog. Any required field trips or supplementary, non-textbook items that are required to be purchased by the student needs to be listed in the catalog description, as well. If a course is deemed repeatable, within the current Title 5 guidelines ([55041](#)), the number of times the course may be taken for credit should be stated as the last sentence.

viii. Courses Embedded -- If the course is cross-listed (Same As), or if the catalog description makes reference to another course, then the course identifier referenced in the fields above should be put here. This effectively links the two courses in SOCRATES so when changes to one course occur, the developer will know that changes may affect the embedded course. If curricular changes requires action from another department that oversees the embedded course, the developer should communicate with the affected department.

c. LEARNING OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES --The outline must state the student learning outcomes (SLOs) of the course, that is, what students will be able to do upon successfully completing the course. The SLOs should use active verbs and must be measurable. They must establish that critical thinking is an integral part of the course. Transfer-level (300-400 level courses) should exclusively use critical thinking verbs (those at the upper-levels of Bloom's taxonomy). For example, rather than "describe animal hunting behavior" state "compare and contrast social aspects of hunting tactics of major mammals."

d. COURSE TOPICS -- The central component of the outline is the course topics. This section should include a complete listing of the topics taught in the course including the number of hours devoted to each topic during the semester. These topics should be written in complete sentences and show a clear connection to the course outcomes. Sufficient detail should be provided to allow transfer institutions to assess the course for articulation. Break-up large chunks of time into separate course topics; no more than six hours should be spent on any given course topic.

In courses that have lecture only, the course topics should show how the instructor guides learning. For example, each course topic may begin: "Lecture topics include..." or "The instructor will introduce..."

In courses that have lab only, the course topics are typically student-driven (e.g. hands-on activities in art studio, science labs, and physical activity courses). The topics should include the student learning activities to be completed for each block of time. For example, each section may begin: "The student will practice..." or "Lab activities include..."

In courses that have lecture and lab components, the course topics for each section should be in separate fields with the assigned hours for each lecture topic or lab topic.

Course topics must also include time for assessments. Each course must have at least two hours allocated to a final exam, and if a department decides that typically more than two hours are dedicated to assessments (e.g. summative midterm assessments or quizzes) then the number of assessment hours should be increased.

e. INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY MODALITIES -- This section does not appear in recent CORs. As courses are revised, this section will disappear.

f. METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES -- The type or examples of methods of instruction should be specifically related to the course outcomes. They should provide guidance to instructors in designing their class sessions, for example, rather than stating "lecture" the description might be "lecture and demonstration by instructor, with in-class practice, including feedback, coaching, and evaluation by the instructor." Classes with labs should be descriptive about lab activities.

g. TYPICAL HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS -- The outline should include two examples of typical homework assignments and should be directly related to the student learning outcomes and objectives of the course. They should be specific enough to provide guidance to faculty and clear expectations for students. It is appropriate to simply cut-and-paste a brief example of a typical assignment. Alternatively, a description of the type or examples of assignments may be given. For example, rather than "term paper" state "Students may complete a term paper comparing and contrasting methods of measuring population size in plant versus animal species, with a bibliography submitted in APA format."

This section must establish that the work is demanding enough in rigor to fulfill the credit level specified. The nature of the assignments must clearly demand critical thinking.

h. EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT METHODS -- Types and examples of methods of evaluation should be listed. An example of how this can be done is: "Evaluation methods may include, but are not limited to: in-class discussions, quizzes, exams, writing assignments, and group project presentations."

This section should be substantively related to the stated outcomes of the course. The evaluation must clearly show that critical thinking skills are required. Types or examples should be extensive enough to show that all course outcomes are evaluated. Statements in this section should clearly show the *basis* for grading. For example, "term paper shows topic coverage, basis of comparison, and critical analysis."

i. DISTANCE EDUCATION -- If the course is to be offered by distance education, the department must agree on the maximum percentage allowable to be taught by distance education. The percentages in SOCRATES are 25, 33, 50, 67, 75, and 100. It is possible to specify additional limitations (for example, specifying certain instructional activities and/or assessments as in-person activities). The FLC Curriculum Committee's Distance Education (DE) subcommittee drafted guidelines (Appendix B), and the Curriculum Committee (a subcommittee of the Academic Senate) approved them in February 2013:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1E2fpEQx5kY_IJ3EDf7OJaZv1F8qEjBc-DA7if-hjTzA/edit?usp=sharing

j. LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE TEXTBOOKS -- Please supply at least two examples of specific titles, author(s), publisher, date of publication and ISBN. When possible, all textbooks listed should be no more than five years old. The textbooks and other instructional materials should show the required rigor and scope. Textbooks should be written for college level students. Transfer-level courses, must have at least one text published within the last five years. Science lab classes must also include a required lab manual. These lab manuals may be published or instructor-generated.

If the textbook is more than 6 years old, then the term: (*Classic*) should be placed after the title in parenthesis. This designation is reserved for eminent texts in an academic discipline and should be used sparingly.

If "instructor-designed materials" are to be supplied, this can be listed in supplementary requirements.

If the student is required to purchase items for success in the course, such as a USB flash drive, goggles for lab work or discipline-specific dance shoes, these items should be listed in the supplementary requirements (as well as in the catalog description).

k. ADDITIONAL COURSE INFORMATION --

i. Faculty Disciplines: This section specifies the minimum qualifications (MQs) to teach the course. The [Minimum Qualifications Handbook](#) defines the qualifications (education and/or experience) to teach in a faculty discipline. It is best to look at courses in the district that share the same number, and align the disciplines. Colleges that define MQs more broadly for a course could allow adjuncts to teach a course at one campus, but not another.

ii. The short title for the transcript should be no more than 24 letters long, and must accurately reflect the title of the course. No additional information may be in the short title that does not appear in the full title of the course. It is not necessary to abbreviate the course title if the full title is fewer than 24 letters long.

iii. Type of Grading: Two options are possible, letter grade and pass/no pass. Letter grades allow for the greatest flexibility. Students may still petition to take a letter graded course on a pass/no pass basis through the fourth week of the semester. If a course is offered exclusively on a pass/no pass basis, the students may not petition to receive a letter grade. The grading method may affect student transfer options, so it is best to use the pass/no pass option judiciously.

iv. Times Taken for Credit: Title 5 section [55041](#) lists categories of repeatable courses. All other courses can only be taken once for credit.

v. Enrollment Family: Select here, if applicable to your subject, if the course is part of an enrollment family (required of [active participatory courses](#)). For example, students are allowed to take 4 classes within an enrollment family, so they might take Ballet I, then Ballet II, in their third semester enroll in Ballet III and then finally Ballet IV in order to have four discrete experiences during their two years at FLC.

vi. If the course is **cross-listed** with any other course at FLC and you have had a discussion with all faculty concerned (and have interdepartmental agreement), cross listed courses are then listed in this section (cross-listing is accomplished in the Basic Course Information section, too). Cross-listed courses should also be “embedded” in the course description so SOCRATES links the two. When revising cross-listed courses, both courses must go through the revision process simultaneously to ensure consistency.

vii. Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) Code: The California Community College Chancellor’s office maintains a [repository of TOP Codes](#). These codes are used to identify similar programs and courses across the state. In general, departmental faculty are in the best position to correctly classify a course/program. Correctly classifying a course/program into the most appropriate TOP code is academically responsible, but it also ensures that data for state and federal funding (both for the college and for the student) are accurately collected. TOP Codes annotated with an asterisk are designated as CTE.

viii. Student Accountability Model (SAM) Code: The SAM code applies to courses only, and it is determined by the TOP code. It is used to determine the degree to which a course is occupational. Any non-CTE course/program must have the SAM Code “E,” non-occupational. Introductory CTE courses (those with no prerequisites) should be listed as SAM Code “D,” possibly occupational. Mid-level CTE courses (those that may have prerequisites, and are generally taken by students who are well along the way to completing their program should be listed as SAM Code “C,” clearly occupational. Capstone or advanced courses with one or more prerequisites with SAM Code “C” should be listed as SAM Code “B,” advanced occupational. The final SAM Code, “A,” (apprenticeship) is reserved for courses where students work as an apprentice. These courses must be approved by several government entities before they can be offered.

I. PREREQUISITE JUSTIFICATION -- Please explain here the criteria for why a prerequisite, corequisite, and/or advisory has/have been required. The explanation may involve content review, selecting SLOs of the prerequisite/corequisite/advisory course required of students to succeed in the current course. Also, list here any content review or validation studies that have informed the justification for the prerequisite. Other justifications include articulation (citing three UC and/or CSU campuses with a similar lower-division course and a prerequisite/corequisite). Health and Safety and Statutes may also be cited to justify prerequisites and corequisites. Please see the Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory handbook in the Appendix for more information.

m. RELATIONSHIP TO COLLEGE PROGRAMS -- Many of these fields are automatically populated with other text that may not be appropriate for the field, and therefore some fields require separate action(s) to change them.

i. Need/Purpose: Local and statewide approvals are based partly on an evaluation of need. When developing this statement a faculty member should address the student need for the course. Another aspect of need is showing that the course plays a role in the curriculum that no other course fulfills effectively.

ii. Associate Degree Competency: Generally this applies only to Math, Reading, and Writing courses. This field may be populated if satisfactory completion of this course meets competency for an Associate degree. A course proposed for Math, Reading, or Writing competency is submitted to the articulation officer who forwards the recommendation to the college curriculum chair. The proposal then goes to the District Curriculum Committee chair who then sends the proposal to the district competency committee. Most competency committees meet electronically and only as needed. Upon recommendation of the competency committee, the District Curriculum Committee affirms the approval/denial of the course for the competency requirement.

iii. Ethnic/Multicultural Studies Requirement: When requesting GE Ethnic/Multicultural credit for the AA or transfer, the course topics must illustrate specific lecture topics that compare and contrast non-western or marginalized populations, ethnocentrism, and issues in diversity. The Multicultural, General Education, and Baccalaureate subcommittee reviews courses for this requirement.

iv. Associate Degree GE Pattern: If the course can be applied to one or more local AA/AS degrees, that is indicated here. The Multicultural, General Education, and Baccalaureate subcommittee reviews courses for this requirement.

v. Degrees and Certificates: The course may be applicable to one or more programs, and those are listed here. These are auto-populated, and as the programs are revised to add or remove courses, this field will automatically change. When a course is deleted, the degrees and certificates to which it applies must also be revised to remove references to those courses from the list of requirements/electives.

vi. Prerequisite to: This field is auto-populated. If another course requires the present course as a prerequisite, it will be listed here. If changes to content or SLOs are made, it is possible that the courses listed in this field may be affected.

vii. Corequisite to: This field is auto-populated. If students must be concurrently enrolled in this course in order to take another course, then the other course is listed here. This field is often populated for lecture/lab courses where students may take the lecture alone, and in order to take the lab a student must be concurrently (or previously) enrolled in the lecture.

viii. Advisory to: This field is auto-populated. If another course requires the present course as an advisory, it will be listed here. If changes to content or SLOs are made, it is possible that the courses listed in this field may be affected.

ix. Embedded in Descriptions: This field is auto-populated. Other courses may reference the present course in their descriptions (either as a cross-listed course, prerequisite, degree requirement, etc...). If a curriculum developer embeds this course in the description of another course, then the other course will appear here. This

information should be used to know whether changes to the present course may affect another course.

n. RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS -- If the course is transferable to other colleges, that is listed here. The following are types of relationships to transfer institutions:

- CSU Transfer
- UC Transfer
- CSU General Education
- IGETC
- C-ID

The Articulation Officer (AO) manages these fields. Requests for UC transferability are submitted once a year, during the summer. CSU GE and IGETC requests are submitted once a year in December.

Courses numbered 300 and above are automatically granted CSU transfer status. UC transfer requires that a similar lower division course exists within the UC system. More information regarding articulation is presented in Section VI.

o. FEASIBILITY -- This section only needs to be completed for a “New to College” or “New to District” course.

i. Departmental Planning: This section is where faculty describe the departmental planning involved in planning to offer the course, and how it fits into the curriculum offerings cycle (sequencing the course offering). Faculty can also explain if the course is part of a degree, or certificate. This section can assist the curriculum committee (and department) in clarifying the need and available resources to offer the course and meet students’ educational goals.

ii. Folsom Lake College Impact: Will the course development affect other courses, classroom space/scheduling at FLC? A course should be unique, and the committee tries to avoid duplicating courses at the college. The District Curriculum Coordinating Committee ensures that there are no duplicate courses in the district.

iii. Los Rios Impact: How the course might affect similar offerings at the sister colleges? Will there be any impact on LRCCD, such as program redundancy or perhaps through this course development, students might benefit through streamlined shared course offerings across the district?

iv. Staffing: List here if any specialized staffing is required for the development of the course such as a lab technician or an athletics trainer.

v. Facilities: Is there a specific room needed to offer this course, or are new facilities needed in order to offer the course? List it/them here in Facilities.

vi. Equipment and Supplies: If there is an anticipated annual required budget to offer this course successfully, list it here.

vii. Library: If there are specific titles or genres/subjects you are requesting for the library to supply in order to successfully offer this course, list it here as a means to alert the library about this need. Listing specific titles here will not guarantee that they will be purchased and available, but it does put your subject in the queue so that the FLC

librarians have an idea of what they could buy when it's budget time in order to support your course offering. Otherwise, the standard language to insert in this section is: "The library currently has adequate materials to support this course."

p. DIGITAL SIGNATURES -- Please contact your colleagues district-wide about your launched course. In a very collegial e-mail, you might e-mail your counterparts across the district (whose names appear in the Digital Signatures section) and let them know you've launched a curriculum revision (or new proposed curriculum), that you welcome their feedback, and would appreciate a digital signature at their earliest convenience. This sort of collegial handling of signature requests invites the opportunity to collaborate with your colleagues at the sister colleges, and also might garner some advice, insight, and suggestions about the proposed curriculum.

However, usually, they just sign off and the curriculum moves forward in the process.

C. Independent Study (295/495) Courses

Proposals for Independent Study require completion of an [Independent Studies Petition and Instructions](#) form. The instructor is responsible for working with the student(s) and area dean to complete the form, and include an outline of instructional activities. The outline is essentially a miniature version of a SOCRATES outline that describes the course, identifies learning outcomes, lists course topics and the amount of time spent on each topic, instructional methods, and evaluation/assessment methods. Independent study courses are lab courses, so one unit of credit must equal 54 hours of student-led (independent) study. Upon completion of the form, submit the form to the Tech Review Chair who reviews and signs the form. Signed forms go to the area dean. The dean forwards proposals to Admissions and Records by Monday of the 6th week of the semester. A&R contacts the student to get her/him registered in the class.

D. Experimental Offering (299/499) Courses

Experimental Offering courses are supposed to be pilot courses to determine the viability of offering a course on a permanent basis. By definition, these courses are not program-applicable, that is, they cannot be used to meet general education or degree/certificate requirements. An experimental offering course can be offered up to two times before the course must be submitted to the curriculum committee as a regular course offering. These types of courses go through local (FLC) approval only, and do not require district or Board approval. Developers are strongly encouraged to consult with other Los Rios colleges to determine any impact on other colleges.

E. Work Experience (198/498) Courses

Work Experience courses are overseen by the Work Experience Coordinator. There are general work experience courses (WEXP 198 and WEXP 498). There are also discipline-specific work experience courses in different designators (e.g. ACCT 498). Work experience awards credit at the rate of 75 hours per unit to students who are employed in paid work or 60 hours per unit to students in unpaid work. A student may earn up to a maximum of 16 units of any kind of work experience with more limitations on the total number of units a student may earn in each

enrollment period according to Title 5 [55253](#). Students must consult with the Work Experience Coordinator to receive unit credit.

Part III: Stages of the Curriculum Process

A faculty member or department identifies a need or observes a problem with a department's existing curriculum. Typically, this need or problem is addressed by the addition, modification, or deletion of a course, degree, or certificate. Additionally, the ACCJC requires that curriculum is regularly reviewed.

A. Draft Status

Curriculum developers may propose to develop new, revise, or delete courses and programs. The following are notes to keep in mind during the early stages of curriculum development.

Although the developer will take the lead in drafting a proposal, it's important to remember that the developer is acting on behalf of the entire department. To avoid unnecessary work at a later date, faculty curriculum developers should communicate early and frequently with the rest of the department as well as professors in related disciplines. Similarly, since the four Los Rios colleges employ a common numbering system, it is also recommended that department faculty at the other Los Rios colleges be made aware of new courses or substantial revisions (e.g. changing prerequisites) that are being proposed as soon as possible. Departments should also work with their dean to identify resources to offer the course, and a timeline for when the course could be offered.

Substantial changes to courses (e.g. units, hours, prerequisites, and major changes to course content) may also affect articulation agreements with four-year colleges. Consult with the articulation officer if the department is considering making such changes. Additionally, if a course is tied to a program (degree or certificate) outside the department, consult with faculty in the other department to make them aware of the proposed substantial change.

In the early stages of the drafting process, some developers may wish to work on their own and not receive feedback from others. For developers in this early stages it is recommended that they write and edit draft proposal documents using a word processor on their own computers. When they are satisfied, they transfer what they have written into a draft proposal in the SOCRATES Curriculum Management System where the curriculum proposal is visible to anyone with access to SOCRATES.

Alternatively, some developers prefer to compose their draft curriculum proposals directly into SOCRATES, bypassing the early development stage described above. Although the course is visible to any Los Rios employee, it is clearly marked as *Draft*, and most SOCRATES users understand that any proposal in *Draft* status is “under construction.”

The developer then completes the curriculum proposal outline in SOCRATES, making sure that the outline conforms to the *FLC Curriculum Style Guide*. Once the outline is complete, the developer launches the proposal for the entire department’s review.

To start a proposal:

SOCRATES > Curriculum Developer > [Create New / Revise Existing / Delete Existing]

To launch a proposal to *Department Review* status:

SOCRATES > Curriculum Developer > My [Course/Program] Proposals > [Course/Program Identifier] > Submission Options > Launch Proposal

To withdraw a proposal from consideration:

SOCRATES > Curriculum Developer > My [Course/Program] Proposals > [Course/Program Identifier] > Submission Options > Withdraw Proposal

B. Department Review

At this stage, the department as a whole has a chance to look at, comment on, and make editing suggestions to the course or program outline.

The department chair receives an email notification with a digital signature request when a proposal is launched and reaches *Department Review* status in SOCRATES. It is up to the department chair to determine how to conduct the departmental discussion about the proposal. Based upon the department’s response, the developer may be asked to make changes to the proposal, or even to withdraw it. If the department decides to move forward with a proposal, the department chair records the department vote in SOCRATES and affixes a digital signature to the proposals, moving the proposal to the *Tech Review* stage in SOCRATES. Please note that the curriculum process and SOCRATES requires a positive department vote in order to advance. Proposals not approved by the department should be withdrawn by the developer.

i. To enter a department vote and affix a digital signature:

SOCRATES > Signature Request > List of Signature Requests > [Course/Program] Proposals > Department Chair or Designee Signature Requests > [Specific Course/Program Proposal] > Enter the number of “yes,” “no,” and “abstain” votes. (note that comments are archived in Socrates, use this field judiciously)
> Click through until you get “Congratulations.”

The four Los Rios colleges participate in a common numbering system and have some shared courses. Department chairs also serve as discipline contacts for proposals from

associated departments at other colleges. For example, the ARC Psychology department chair will receive digital signature requests for Psychology proposals originating at CRC, FLC, and SCC. Please note that, as discipline contact, department chairs may also receive digital signature requests from related departments. For example, the Art chair receives signature requests about Graphic Communication (GCOM) proposals as well as Art. Only one discipline contact is specified per campus. If a curriculum proposal could affect other disciplines, please make them aware of the potential impact.

The purpose of signature requests in this context is to provide an opportunity for the same department at multiple colleges to acknowledge and comment on proposed curriculum activity at a sister college. The goal is to promote communication and coordination among the Los Rios colleges related to departmental curriculum. Please note, however, that any comments made as part of the digital signature are a permanent fixture on the curriculum outline. If you have concerns about an item of curriculum from another college, it is advised that you contact the developer via email or phone regarding those concerns.

To acknowledge/comment on a department proposal at another Los Rios college and affix a digital signature:

SOCRATES > Signature Request > List of Signature Requests > [Course/Program] Proposals > Discipline Contact Signature Requests > [Specific Course/Program Proposal] > Click through until you get “Congratulations.”

ii. Collaboration Requests

Some courses are shared by two or more colleges. For example, ENGWR 300: College Composition is offered by all four Los Rios colleges. If a developer at one college wishes to change the header information (designator, title, units, course number) for a shared course, a collaboration request is first sent to all impacted colleges. The department chair at each college consults with his or her faculty about whether to collaborate with the header change. If yes, the chair agrees to participate and becomes responsible for the header revision proposal. If any department declines the invitation to revise the header information of the shared course then communicate with the local curriculum chair who will work with the district curriculum chair to withdraw the collaboration request.

Once a collaboration request has been approved by all colleges, each college must then revise the course (i.e. send it through their curriculum process). Locally, the department chair is by default responsible to revise the course. Another faculty member can be designated (if all parties are in agreement) to shepherd the collaboration request curriculum change through the process. Such a change can be made by the curriculum chair. When all colleges have completed the revision, the change becomes active for the next printed catalog. Faculty are urged to be aware of these collaboration requests, and cooperate with faculty at sister colleges to revise curriculum in accordance with a collaborative change. Delays may negatively impact our sister colleges.

To collaborate/decline to collaborate, as a department, on a shared course proposal at another Los Rios college and affix a digital signature:

SOCRATES > Signature Request > List of Collaboration Requests > [Specific Shared Course Proposal]

C. Tech Review

Proposals officially enter the curriculum process when the department chair records the department vote and digitally signs the proposal, advancing the proposal to *Tech Review* status. Departments cannot submit proposals to the *Tech Review* stage until they are complete.

Curriculum developers are invited to attend a Tech Review meeting where the curriculum will be reviewed. During the Tech Review meeting, subcommittee members may ask for corrections or modifications to the course or program outline, based on criteria as noted in this handbook and elsewhere. Corrections could be to fix simple misspellings and grammatical errors, to complete missing sections, or to update or format textbook citations. The subcommittee may ask for modifications to the outline to conform to Title 5, Los Rios Community College District regulations, and/or articulation requirements. The subcommittee may ask for verification that collegial consultation has occurred between the developer and other faculty from disciplines that the proposed course may be related to.

Other subcommittees review proposals at this stage as necessary. Proposals to offer a course by distance education (DE) are reviewed and approved separately by the Distance Education Subcommittee. The DE subcommittee may also request edits to the course outline in Socrates. These requested edits are typically sent to the Tech Review chair who communicates the changes to the faculty developer. The Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory subcommittee approves proposals to add, remove, and validate prerequisites, corequisites, advisories, and enrollment limitations on curriculum.

The Tech Review chair sends corrections and modifications to developers. Please make the changes in Socrates as soon as possible, and inform the Tech Review chair when the changes have been made. The Tech Review chair may check to ensure that all edits have been made, then forwards the list of courses ready for *1st Reading* on to the Curriculum Chair.

Courses must be revised within a reasonable time period. Proposals that have been in Tech Review awaiting responses from developers for six months from the Tech Review date are subject to being withdrawn.

D. 1st Reading

Only proposals that the Tech Review Subcommittee has moved to *1st Reading* status are considered by the full Curriculum Committee (or in some instances, by assigned reading groups). Prior to the scheduled first reading the Curriculum Committee members will review the outline. If there are no or only minor editing changes to be made, the *1st Reading* proposals are moved to *2nd Reading* status (pending changes are made), and the proposal is scheduled for the next Curriculum Committee Meeting (usually two to three weeks later). If there are major edits, corrections, or questions, the Committee may keep a proposal at *1st Reading* status.

At this stage, depending upon the requests made in the curriculum outline, other subcommittees of Curriculum will get involved. For example, if there is a transferability request or a GE request, the Multicultural, General Education, and Baccalaureate subcommittee will review the request and provide feedback.

Curriculum developers are invited to attend a Curriculum Committee meeting to hear feedback directly from committee members. Upon addressing all requested edits, a developer must contact the curriculum chair to notify her/him that the changes have been made before the course is advanced to second reading.

E. 2nd Reading

In general, the committee reviews each curriculum proposal twice, once at 1st Reading and again at 2nd Reading. The idea is provide a period of time for additional reflection and discussion of the merits of a particular proposal. In general, the Committee checks each 2nd Reading proposal to see if the editing changes asked for at 1st Reading have been made. If so, the proposal is advanced to the next stage of the curriculum process. If not, the proposal is held at 2nd Reading status until the corrections have been completed.

F. Consent/FYI

Proposals that have only minor changes to existing curriculum, such as fixing typos or minor updates to a course list in a degree program to reflect a course deletion, may be reviewed by the Curriculum chair in conjunction with the Tech Review chair. Once approved, the chairs would then present the revision to the full Committee to seek their approval by consent. With the Committee's consent, these course proposals move straight to Catalog status with a new effective date in SOCRATES. Consent/FYI is used outside of the six-year curriculum review timeline. Consent/FYI does not reset the curriculum review clock.

G. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee

Because Folsom Lake College participates with other Los Rios colleges in a common numbering system and curriculum developments at one college may impact another, *New to District* course proposals, *New to College* course proposals, Collaboration requests, and *Course Deletion* proposals are moved to District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) status in SOCRATES upon approval by the FLC Curriculum Committee.

Similarly, *New Program* (certificate and degree) proposals as well as *Program Deletion* proposals are forwarded to DCCC. The purpose of the DCCC is to address issues of coordination, not the quality of particular outlines. Upon consensus of the DCCC, the local Curriculum Chairs move proposals to the next status level. Typically, *New to College* course proposals are moved to *Catalog* status since the Board of Trustees has already approved this course for another Los Rios college. All others are moved to *Board* status.

H. Board of Trustees (Board or BOT)

The Board of Trustees reserves the right to approve all *New to District* courses and programs and all course and program deletions. Proposals at *Board* status are voted on by Los Rios Board of Trustees at their regular meetings.

I. California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO)

New Program proposals, particularly CTE or transfer (Associate Degree for Transfer) certificates and degrees are reviewed and chaptered by the CCCCCO. Upon notification from the CCCCCO, colleges may begin to advertise and offer chaptered programs. All courses (except Work Experience) and all other programs get streamlined review from the CCCCCO, and may be advertised and offered in the next available term.

J. Catalog

When a course or program proposal has been approved by all the appropriate bodies, the Curriculum Chair moves the item to *Catalog* status with an effective date in SOCRATES. Once effective, the new curriculum is official and the changes may be published in the print and web course catalog or addendum. Curriculum proposals that get to catalog status can generally take effect on June 1 or January 1, whichever is sooner, however, substantial changes to the course title, units, prerequisites, distance education, degree applicability, articulation, and transfer are not always immediately effective. Substantial changes to units, title, prerequisites/corequisites/advisories/enrollment limitations, and degree applicability can only take effect on June 1 and must complete the curriculum process the previous fall semester to make it into the college catalog for the following year.

Catalog addenda are published in June and November each year. The purpose of the addenda is to advertise newly approved courses and programs and to correct errors in the general catalog. The articulation officer gets reports on CSU GE, UC Transfer, and IGETC applicability, and enters these effective dates into SOCRATES. The catalog addenda may be used to include articulation information that CSU/UC did not send to the FLC prior to publishing the catalog,

In summary, the length of time it takes to shepherd a course proposal from initial idea to final outline (Catalog status) depends on how many stages it must pass through in the curriculum process. The table below lists the stages associated with each type of course proposal.

	Revision	New to College	New to District	Deletion	Consent/FYI
Draft	X	X	X	X	X
Department Review	X	X	X	X	X
Tech Review	X	X	X	X	X

1 st reading	X	X	X	X	
2 nd reading	X	X	X	X	
DCCC		X	X	X	
Board			X	X	
Catalog	X	X	X	X	X

Part IV: Program Approval

Program proposals vary in complexity depending on the type of program (degree or certificate), the program goal (transfer, local, or CTE), and the type of proposal (revision, program deletion, or new program).

A. Certificates:

There are three types of certificates.

a. Certificates of Recognition requiring fewer than 8 units are approved locally by the Board of Trustees. These low-unit certificates are typically CTE certificates since few transfer programs have so few units.

b. Certificates of Recognition that are 8 to under 16 units may also be approved locally. Though students who declare their intention to pursue a Certificate of Recognition may not be eligible for all forms of financial aid nor will the certificate be noted on a student's transcript. Certain types of financial aid are available for certificates of at least 8 units. All forms of financial aid are available for degrees and certificates of at least 16 units pending those programs meeting other criteria.

c. Certificates of 8 to under 16 units can be sent to the CCCCOC along with a narrative document. When the CCCCOC recognizes such certificates, they can then appear on a student's transcript as Certificates of Achievement upon completion. Certificates of Achievement are at least 16 units, and these must be submitted to the CCCCOC along with a narrative document for recognition and approval.

B. Degrees:

There are four types of degrees: 1. Associate in Science (AS) which include Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) and CTE disciplines. 2. Associate in Arts (AA) which include all other disciplines. 3. Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T), 4. Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T). AA-T and AS-T degrees must follow an appropriate transfer model curriculum outline on the [C-ID website](#).

C. Program Goals:

When developing a degree or certificate, keep the future transfer or employment prospects of students in mind. There are three possible program goals according to the CCCCCO's [Program and Course Approval Handbook \(6th edition\)](#): transfer, local, or CTE.

a. Transfer programs are Certificates of Achievement in CSU-GE or IGETC and Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). ADTs must follow Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) available on the [C-ID website](#). Courses applicable to the degree usually require C-ID articulation or CSU-GE applicability. The college is required to develop ADT degrees if we have a degree in the same TOP Code as the ADT. Revisions to ADTs must remain in line with the TMC. Developing a new ADT or revising an ADT should be done in consultation with the articulation officer.

b. Local degrees and certificates may be community interest programs or they may have a goal of transfer as well. Local interest can be documented by letters from employers, newspapers, etc.... Local transfer programs must have at least 51% of the required courses in the program articulated course-to-course with a program at a CSU/UC campus. The articulation officer can serve as a resource to help structure local transfer programs. There are other ways to document that a program has a transfer goal such as letters of support from a CSU/UC department.

c. Career and Technical Education programs must have an advisory board nominated. The board must meet regularly (at least once per year) with faculty to review the program requirements and outcomes, and ensure that the program continues to meet industry and labor market needs. Advisory board minutes must also be recorded and submitted to the CCCCCO for program approval. Please work with the CTE dean when developing and modifying CTE programs.

D. Program Proposal Types:

In general, programs go through the same steps as courses outlined in Part III above. New programs and certain types of program deletions must go through additional steps. The paragraphs below outline special considerations for program changes in the curriculum process.

a. Revisions:

Program revisions can be substantial or non-substantial. Non-substantial changes are automatically chaptered by the CCCCCO. Substantial changes require a review prior to chaptering. Substantial changes include changes to ADTs, CTE program goals (e.g. degree to certificate), and TOP Code changes.

b. Deletions:

Intentions to delete a program must be noted in planning documents (i.e. Program Review or ADP). Research must be conducted prior to deleting a program, and the data should indicate a compelling reason to no longer maintain a program. Additionally there are also provisions for program appraisals to be conducted by individuals outside of a department. These procedures are outlined in the Program Appraisal and Deletion document in the Appendix. Program deletions must go to the Board of Trustees. Upon Trustee approval, the program will be deleted from the next general catalog. While the program deletion is being proposed, a department and the division dean must compose a plan to offer courses sufficient to satisfy the program

requirements within a two year period. These plans must also be shared with counselors so they may advise students accordingly. The program may still be listed in the CCCCCO inventory to capture any students with catalog rights.

c. New Programs:

New programs must be indicated in planning documents (e.g. ADP). A Future Directions Document (available on the Curriculum Page on the Insider) must be completed, and submitted to the curriculum chair for review and approval by the Curriculum Committee. The purpose of the Future Directions Document is to allow a department to justify the need for the program, and document the resources (e.g. FTE, facilities, and budget) required to offer the program. The document will also make it easier to ultimately submit a narrative to the CCCCCO and regional consortia for the program's recognition and approval.

All new program proposals (except ADTs) must also be approved district-wide by the Program Placement Council (PPC). This list is generated four times per year. In the event that there is disagreement among the Los Rios colleges about a program at a particular college, a convergence is called to try to resolve any issues. The results of the convergence then determine whether the program can be put on the PPC list or not. Programs may be vetted locally by the FLC curriculum committee while district PPC vetting occurs.

For CTE programs, an additional coordinating body called the North-Far North Regional Consortium (NFNRC) reviews program proposals to minimize the potential problem of awarding more CTE degrees/certificates than there are jobs in the area. Before a new CTE program is submitted to the CCCCCO, the program must also have formal recommendation by the NFNRC.

CTE programs must also consult with the CTE dean to get a labor market study (often from the Centers of Excellence, but letters from employers and other sources of support may also be used) for the region. Labor Market Information (LMI) is required by NFNRC and the CCCCCO for program recommendation/chaptering.

The program then goes through the same steps as a new to district course proposal. After the program has been approved by the Board of Trustees, it goes to the CCCCCO for recognition and approval/chaptering. New degrees and certificates stay at CCCCCO status in SOCRATES until the State Chancellor's Office chapters the program and provides FLC with a unique state control number for the program.

The following chart summarizes the steps necessary for a program proposal. The steps are generally in sequence except where noted.

	Revision	Deletion	New Certificate of Recognition (not on a student's transcript)	New Certificate of Achievement ($8 \leq x < 16$ units) or (≥ 16 units)	New Degree (AA / AS / AA-T / AS-T)
ADP Report		X	X	X	X
Program Appraisal ¹		X			
LMI		C	C	C	C
Ensure 51% of courses articulate ²				L	L
Advisory Board	C	C	C	C	C
Future Directions			X	X	X
Complete all steps above before opening a draft proposal in Socrates.					
PPC ³			X	X	X*
NFNRC ³			C	C	C
Draft	X	X	X	X	X
Department Review	X	X	X	X	X
Tech Review	X	X	X	X	X
1 st reading	X	X	X	X	X
2 nd reading	X	X	X	X	X
DCCC		X	X	X	X
Board		X	X	X	X

CCCCO Narrative				X	X
Advisory Board Minutes			C	C	C
CCCCO	X	X		X	X
ACCJC			X	X	X
Catalog	X	X	X	X	X

X = Required (* Except ADTs)

L = Required of local programs

C = Required of CTE programs

¹ Only required if the source of a deletion proposal is not the department. Departments may conduct their own program appraisals and report on the results in their ADP or Program Review documents.

² Except ADTs

³ Local curriculum approval may proceed while awaiting PPC and NFNRC review. Curriculum may not advance beyond the local process until a program appears on the PPC list and/or is recommended by the NFNRC.

Part V: Timelines

Each curriculum proposal is unique. Various factors influence the amount of time that a proposal takes at each stage of the process. The table below provides estimated time ranges for the various curriculum stages.

Curriculum Stage	Expect to Spend
Advisory Board	Varies
51% of courses articulate	Do preliminary research on assist.org to find programs and look at articulation agreements. Communicate with the articulation officer during this process.
Future Directions	The document may take several weeks to complete. Curriculum reviews the document, and they meet twice per month.
PPC	Accept proposals in September, November, February, and April each year. Approve proposals in October, December, March, and May each year.

NFNRC	Meet first Thursday of every month.
Draft	The number of weeks spent depends on the work schedule of the developer.
Department Review	Depends on the department, but typically 0-4 weeks.
Tech Review	0-6 weeks depending on the Tech Review queue. Two weeks is average. Tech Review meets on the 2 nd and 4 th Mondays of the month. Agendas are usually set by Wednesday of the prior week.
First Reading	1.5-3.5 weeks. 3.5 weeks is average. The full committee meets on the 1 st and 3 rd Wednesdays of the month. Agendas are usually set by Wednesday of the prior week.
Second Reading	2-4 weeks. Two weeks is average.
DCCC	Up to 3.5 weeks. DCCC typically meets on the last Friday of the month.
Board	1.5 weeks. The Board of Trustees meets on the second Wednesday of the month.
CCCCO	Varies. ADTs and CTE programs typically require more time.
Catalog	Note the effective date of the curriculum depends on the catalog print deadline. These complexities are explained in Section III above.

Note that the catalog is published in the spring semester. All changes proposed to be effective for the fall semester need to be completed by December. Note that new proposals generally need to be at DCCC or Board status at their final meeting in the fall semester (generally mid-late November for DCCC and the second Wednesday of December for the Board). Please plan accordingly.

Also note that changes to curriculum in your department (e.g. a course deletion) may also affect other courses and programs that reference the deleted course. So it's possible that a chain of curriculum changes will be sparked by one proposal. It's important to work with other departments to let them know how your curriculum action might affect them.

Part VI: Articulation and Transfer

A. Local General Education Review

For GE requests that come from course outlines, the Multicultural, Baccalaureate, and General Education (McBGE) Subcommittee refers to [Board Policy 7241](#) that specifies what the Associate

Degree requirements are—this policy lists what each general education area should cover. In addition, [P-7241](#) specifies what the ethnic/multicultural studies competency requirement is.

B. Transfer Credit to FLC

When a student is transferring in with coursework from a college outside Los Rios, the GE Subcommittees uses a couple of methods. The easiest method is “pass-along”—meaning FLC honors how that course is listed in the transferring college/university’s general education pattern. When a course does not fall within a specified general education area (this happens frequently with ethnic/multicultural studies), the subcommittee looks at the catalog description for the course and if necessary refers to the course outline.

C. Transfer to CSU and UC

All courses numbered 300 and above are CSU-transferable. Some courses may be appropriate to meet CSU general education requirements. Criteria for reviewing such courses is available from the [CSU General Education and IGETC Guiding Notes for General Education Reviews](#).

In order for a course to be UC transferable, a similar, lower-division course must exist somewhere in the UC system. Contact the articulation officer for assistance in finding UC courses. Some UC transferable courses may also meet IGETC, and the Guiding Notes for General Education Reviews also outlines IGETC review criteria.

Course-to-course articulations with each CSU/UC campus are available at [assist.org](#). These types of articulations are initiated by each CSU and UC campus.

In all cases, FLC’s courses are subject to periodic review from CSU, UC, or individual campuses. It’s important to keep curriculum current and to review GE standards periodically to ensure that course transferability is maintained.

D. Other Resources

With respect to baccalaureate level courses, the GE subcommittee refers to several sources as well—one of them being the [Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers](#).

In addition to LRCCD Board Policy [P-7241](#) for the Associates degree GE and graduation requirements, here’s what else the GE Subcommittee uses:

Transfer General Education

CSU General Education: CSU Executive Order 1065 -

<https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html>

CSU General Education and IGETC: Guiding Notes for General Education Reviews -

<https://www.calstate.edu/App/GEAC/documents/GE-Reviewers-Guiding-Notes.pdf>

CSU American Ideals Graduation Requirement: CSU Executive Order 1061 -

<https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1061.html>

CSU General Education Executive Order 1100 -

<https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html>

CSU General Education Executive Order 1110 -

<http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1110.html>

UC Transfer of Credit

UC Transfer Course Agreement Subject Criteria:

<https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html>

CSU Transfer of Credit

CSU Executive Order 167:

<https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-167.pdf>

Appendices

A. Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories, and Enrollment Limitations

Folsom Lake College Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory on Recommended Preparation Manual

Definitions:

Prerequisite courses must be taken prior to enrolling in a target course.

Corequisite courses may be taken concurrently with a target course, or a student may take the corequisite course previously. Processes for challenging a prerequisite or corequisite exist, and these procedures are the purview of the Matriculation and Student Success Committee.

Advisories on recommended preparation are courses that would enhance a student's chances of succeeding in a target course, but a student may choose to enroll in the course without having met the advisory.

Programs consist of groups of related courses that, when completed, result in a degree or certificate.

Title 5 §55003 describes the “Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories on Recommended Preparation.” Both Title 5 §55003 and Los Rios Board Regulation R-2831 outline policies for both establishing and reviewing prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation.

Introduction:

When establishing and/or renewing a prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory, consider existing curriculum across the district. A course with the same designator and number is treated as equivalent at all Los Rios colleges. If prerequisites and corequisites do not align, then it is possible that the courses will not be seen as equivalent. Consult with departmental faculty across the district prior to proposing changes to prerequisites or corequisites.

Consult with affected departments and administration to ensure that sufficient prerequisite and

corequisite course offerings are available to students, and to allow for other affected parties to prepare for workload changes.

Data should drive the initial discussion to implement a prerequisite on a course. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) can assist in, for example, using historical data to compare success rates of students who have completed a course or courses prior to enrolling in a subsequent semester. A statistically significant gap in success would support the need for a prerequisite. The OIR will strive to provide data that account for expected variation across terms, instructors, and modality, among other factors.

When implementing a prerequisite, efforts must be made to ensure that sufficient numbers of prerequisite course sections are offered, and that adding prerequisites does not impede student progress towards achieving an educational goal. Please consult the Enrollment Management Plan.

Measuring disproportionate impact (on student access and success) in student populations is also required for precollegiate communication and computation prerequisites. When disproportionate impact is discovered, the college must include, in its Equity Plan, how it will both identify disproportionate impact, and how the college will work with the Chancellor's Office to address the disproportionate impact.

The curriculum chair and the Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory subcommittee of curriculum are chiefly responsible for reviewing proposals to add or renew prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories.

The **Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory subcommittee** shall consist of (at a minimum):

- Curriculum chair (or designee)
- Articulation officer
- College researcher
- Faculty from English with experience reviewing prerequisite challenges
- Faculty from Math with experience reviewing prerequisite challenges
- Faculty from other disciplines may be appointed on an *ad hoc* basis depending on the need.

The subcommittee reviews proposals for new, revised, and renewed prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories, and makes a recommendation to the curriculum committee for approval. All proposals to establish or renew a prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory must be evaluated separately from the standard curriculum process.

This document also summarizes policies on course and program enrollment limitations. The appendices contain examples to help curriculum developers navigate Socrates.

Establishing prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation for courses:

The FLC Academic Senate makes the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees on establishing a prerequisite, but the Senate may delegate this authority to the curriculum committee.

Discipline faculty, or for a new discipline, departmental faculty are primarily responsible for establishing prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation. The curriculum committee and the prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee must also review and approve any prerequisite or corequisite separately from the course approval. Instituting a prerequisite or corequisite must involve a content review.

Content Review:

Faculty with expertise in the subject matter, and for prerequisites outside of the discipline, faculty with expertise in the prerequisite discipline must conduct the content review. The prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee may also be involved concurrently in this process.

R-2831 1.3.3.1.2 (1) b-c state that the following must be reviewed in the target course: a course syllabus, course outline, tests (including the type and number of tests), instructional materials, course format, grading criteria, and student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Upon review of the above, the faculty identify the knowledge and skills required for entry into or concurrent enrollment in the target course. The knowledge and skills should be matched to the student learning outcomes of one or more prerequisite or corequisite courses.

The Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory subcommittee shall maintain documentation of the completed content review template in Appendix A. Additionally, the curriculum developer shall record the target course and the prerequisite or corequisite course(s), and identify the SLOs required for entrance or concurrent enrollment in the target course, and the date of the content review in Socrates.

In addition to conducting a content review, one of the following levels of scrutiny must be met and specified in the course outline to establish and maintain a prerequisite.

1. **Transfer** requirements may justify a prerequisite. In consultation with the college articulation officer and the prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee, identify three campuses of the University of California and/or California State University systems that offer an equivalent course requiring an equivalent prerequisite and/or corequisite.

2. **Sequential courses within a discipline** (e.g. Chemistry 400 and Chemistry 401 or Math 370 and Math 400) or across disciplines (often for career and technical education (CTE) disciplines for which there are no transfer institutions) must specify the SLOs of the prerequisite and/or corequisite course in the target course outline. This level of scrutiny also applies to closely-related lecture and lab pairings (e.g. Geology 305 and Geology 306).

3. For **non-sequential courses** that do not have equivalent courses at UC/CSU requiring a prerequisite in reading, written expression, or math, content review and research are required. The research requirements can be found in R-2.1.1.7.2 and in Title 5 55003(c), 55003(g), and 55003(l). Locally, data may be gathered by any of the following to establish a prerequisite:

A. Surveying current or former students in a course with a communication or computation prerequisite to measure students' views on the appropriateness of the

prerequisite or corequisite.

B. Comparing faculty members' views of student preparation both with and without the prerequisite course in terms of student performance on any course assessment tool.

C. Correlating student success data at any point in the course to completion of a prerequisite or corequisite course.

D. Comparing student success data in a course to cut score data on assessment tests.

For existing courses proposing a new prerequisite, the department or discipline faculty and the curriculum committee may decide to provisionally approve a prerequisite or corequisite in computation or communication skills for a period of two years while research (i.e. statistical validation as required by Title 5 55002 (g)) is being conducted. R-2.1.1.3.3 states that a syllabus and sample tests and assignments must be used to inform the decision to adopt a provisional prerequisite or corequisite.

For new courses established with communication or computation prerequisites (following the procedures outlined above), the prerequisite is considered provisionally approved for a period of two years while research is being conducted. When the course is scheduled for the first time, students must be informed that they may enroll in the course without the prerequisite. Up to 20% of the students enrolled in any section of the course may lack the prerequisite.

For courses with precollegiate-level (100-level or below) prerequisites in reading, written expression or math, the college is required to collect data to ensure that the prerequisite does not have a disproportionate impact on the success of particular groups of students defined by race, gender, age, or disability. In the event that a disproportionate impact is found, steps must be taken to ensure that the impact is mitigated. Mitigating these steps will involve department or discipline faculty, the prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory committee (or curriculum committee), Office of Institutional Research, and the Student Equity dean.

The course outline in Socrates must include the date that the research was conducted. The prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee and Office of Institutional Research shall maintain copies of the results.

4. **Health and safety** requirements may also be used to justify establishing or renewing a prerequisite or corequisite. The same standard of scrutiny by the department or discipline faculty and the curriculum committee apply here. The justification must be included in the course outline in Socrates, and it must demonstrate how a student's health or safety (or the health and safety or others) might be protected if a student completes a prerequisite or corequisite course.

5. **Statutes or regulations** may justify the establishment or renewal of a prerequisite or corequisite. A citation must appear in the course outline's justification section.

Recency requirements and other measures of readiness:

The procedures above may also be used to implement a recency requirement or some other measure of readiness (for example, a specific performance level). The justification section in the course outline must address the need for the recency requirement or other measure of readiness. The prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee reviews the supporting documentation and justification.

Reviewing prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation for

courses:

R-2831 1.4. and Title 5 55003(b)(4) state that all prerequisites and corequisites are reviewed at least once every six years with the exception of CTE courses (as determined by TOP Code) which are reviewed at least once every two years. Advisories must also be periodically reviewed. The six-year Program Review process shall include a section where prerequisites and/or corequisites are validated by the department or discipline faculty and the curriculum committee.

If a prerequisite is successfully challenged on the basis of not being established following district procedures, violates Title 5 55003, or it is (or applied in a manner that is) discriminatory, then the prerequisite shall be reviewed immediately thereafter.

The FLC process for reviewing a prerequisite or corequisite is as follows:

Discipline faculty or a department must enter an appropriate updated justification in Socrates, and the SLOs of the prerequisite and/or corequisite course must be selected in the updated target course. Please enter dates in the text box to show that the prerequisite validation was done. CTE courses should also acknowledge that the advisory board continues to support the prerequisite/corequisite.

1. If the course continues to have at least three UC/CSUs that offer a similar lower division course with the same prerequisite, then select “Content Review + Articulation” in Socrates. Complete the three fields to cite the respective catalogs. This justification may also apply to courses that cannot articulate without a specific communication or computation prerequisite.
2. If the course is a sequential prerequisite within or across disciplines, or it is a part of a closely-related lecture and lab pairing, please select “Content Review + Other” and update the SLOs as appropriate. Enter an updated date of the validation (a semester is fine) in the text box.
3. If the prerequisite/corequisite has a health and safety requirement, please select “Content Review + Health/Safety” in Socrates. Complete the text box to explain how the prerequisite continues to be justified. Indicate the semester in which the validation was completed.
4. If the prerequisite/corequisite is justified by a statute or regulation, please verify the citation, and enter the semester in which the prerequisite was validated.
5. For nonsequential courses, including courses with communication or computation prerequisites or corequisites, please submit a research request to the prerequisite/corequisite/advisory subcommittee and the OIR. An initial validation study must occur within two years of implementing the prerequisite or corequisite. Subsequent studies must occur every six years thereafter or whenever the curriculum goes through a substantial revision (whichever comes first). The research may survey students and/or faculty at any time during the semester to assess whether the prerequisite/corequisite remains necessary and appropriate for the course.

In addition, following the timelines established above, demographic data must be collected from courses with precollegiate (i.e. basic skills) communication or computation prerequisites or corequisites. The disaggregated data shall be used only to measure disproportionate impact on student success and access to the target course. Disproportionate impact may be demonstrated by differences in student access and student achievement in the

course. When data suggest a disproportionate impact, the college will work with the CCCCCO to mitigate the impact. Mitigation steps may involve re-evaluating the curriculum and reallocation of resources.

Enrollment Limitations on Courses:

Performance courses:

Performance courses such as those requiring public performance (for example, dance, music performance, theater arts, competitive speech, journalism, etc...) or intercollegiate athletics may establish auditions or try-outs as enrollment limitations. If there are degrees or certificates that require a course with a proposed enrollment limitation, there must be an alternate course without such a limitation that would also satisfy the requirement. These course alternatives must be included in the course outline of record. Every six years, data must be collected to ensure that the enrollment limitation in a performance course does not have a disproportionate impact on enrollment of historically underrepresented groups.

Honors courses:

Limitations on enrollment may be placed on honors courses following the same procedures as above. Provisions must be made to allow for alternate courses or sections (in the case of specifying an honors section) that would meet the same degree requirement as the honors course or section. If it is an honors course that is proposed, the course outline must specify other courses that would meet the same requirement.

Cohorts:

Blocks of courses or blocks of course sections may include two or more courses or sections with enrollment limited to a specific cohort of students. If sections are reserved, then a reasonable number of sections must not have these enrollment limitations. Additionally, in the cases of courses with enrollment limitations that are degree-applicable, a list of alternative courses lacking the enrollment limitation must be included in the course outline.

Adding and Renewing Prerequisites or Enrollment Limitations on Programs:

R-2831 2.1.1.5 requires that program prerequisites may only have prerequisites if the prerequisite exists for at least one course that is required for the program. Therefore, the procedures for adding a prerequisite for a course shall also apply for adding a prerequisite to a program.

Some programs may have statutes, regulations, or other accrediting bodies that require enrollment limitations, and these must be explicitly cited in documents accompanying new program submissions (e.g. Future Directions Document and Chancellor's Office narrative), and the continued relevance of these limitations on enrollment must be documented in Program Review.

Timelines:

Establishing or changing a prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory:

New or revised prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories can only be made effective in the following year's catalog. In other words, mid-year changes are not possible. The printed college catalog is the official document informing students of course prerequisites, corequisites, and

advisories. The catalog has a print deadline in early spring semester. Therefore, all new or revised prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories must be at catalog status by early spring semester. The curriculum review process may take around two to three months, and the collegial consultations across the district may take some time to complete, so the process must begin early in the fall semester. OIR data collection should occur in the previous spring semester for prerequisite validations that occur the following year.

Validating a prerequisite where statistical validation is necessary:

The OIR and prerequisite, corequisite, and advisory subcommittee must be informed of a research request early in the fall semester of the second year after implementing a nonsequential prerequisite. The OIR data should be used to make an assessment whether the prerequisite or corequisite remains necessary and appropriate.

Every six years thereafter, research requests must be made in the fall semester of the year during which the course is to be revised.

For CTE courses (as determined by TOP Code), the advisory board must be consulted in the fall semester of the year in which the course is due for review. In situations where there is a requirement for research, a request to the OIR must be submitted in the fall semester.

The Office of Instruction informs the Chancellor's Office of new prerequisites by August 1st each year. The Chancellor's Office notification must also specify the level of scrutiny used to implement a new or revised prerequisite or corequisite.

Appendix A:

Proposal to Establish a Prerequisite, Corequisite, or Limitation on Enrollment using Content Review

Date:

Target Course:

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite Course(s):

1. Please attach the following for the target course:
 - a representative course syllabus.
 - the proposed course outline.
 - a sample of tests or other assessments (including the type and number of tests).
 - and representative grading criteria.

2. Note the SLOs from the prerequisite course, and identify the SLO(s) that are necessary and appropriate for students to succeed in any aspect of the attachments. You may wish to annotate the attachments with the SLO from the proposed prerequisite/corequisite course(s).

3. Research is required for a precollegiate communication or computation prerequisite. The research results may be appended to this document.

The Prerequisite, Corequisite, and Advisory subcommittee will review the proposal, and approval is based on strong evidence being provided to warrant the prerequisite or corequisite.

B: Distance Education Guidelines

Approved by the Curriculum Committee, 02/21/13

Folsom Lake College Guidelines for Online, Hybrid and Web-Enhanced Instruction

Definitions:

Online course – An online course is a course that is offered over the Internet. 100% of class meetings, assignments, lectures, and assessments are online.

Hybrid course – A hybrid course is a course that is taught using similar web-based tools and activities as an online class. Some portion of the course meeting time is conducted online, and the remaining percentage of the class is conducted onground.

Web-Enhanced course – The class is taught face-to-face in a classroom for 100% of the course hours, but classroom assignments and materials are supplemented with web-based activities. Examples would be online projects, handouts and other course materials available online. Web-Enhanced courses do not replace any required class time, as such they do not require separate DE Curriculum approval.

Learning Management System (LMS) – The LMS is a system that provides a set of tools for online, hybrid, and web-enhanced courses. The LMS infrastructure is maintained by DO-IT. LMS is not synonymous with “online course,” as there are many ways to create an online course that do not make use of a Learning Management System.

1. General Guidelines for Online, Hybrid, and Web-Enhanced Courses

1.1. Every course website, whether the LMS or a third-party application or service should include the following information:

1.1.a. the college name,

1.1.b. a link from the course home page to the FLC Home Page:

<http://www.flc.losrios.edu/>,

1.1.c. the name of the course,

1.1.d. the name of the professor and contact information for the professor.

1.2. Web Accessibility: Every course-related website at FLC should meet the legal requirements imposed by Section 508 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act and ADA guidelines.

1.3. Publisher-provided textbook related websites may be considered an appropriate and acceptable alternative to the LMS or to other district or college websites.

1.4. Any faculty member wanting to use non-district resources for their online, hybrid, or web-enhanced course should consider:

1.4.a. Security of students’ information on the outside server.

1.4.b. Reliability, performance and availability of the outside server

- 1.4.c. ADA/Section 508 compliance of outside server.
- 1.5. Courses must receive separate DE approval to be offered in online or hybrid modalities.

2. Development of Online Courses

It is recommended that the faculty member assigned to teach an online or hybrid course for the first time meet with the Instructional Design and Development Coordinator:

- 2.1. To discuss the instructional design resources to support the development of the online course,
- 2.2. To discuss the professor's plans for the course,
- 2.3. To discuss training resources available for learning to teach online,
- 2.4. To discuss other resources available to assist the faculty member in developing and maintaining their course, and
- 2.5. To ensure the faculty member is aware of the ADA guidelines.

3. Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights

- 3.1. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that any materials used on a course-related website do not infringe copyright.
- 3.2. Faculty members' intellectual property rights concerning course content are protected under Article 28 of the Los Rios Community College District Collective Bargaining Agreement with Los Rios College Federation of Teachers - see <http://www.lrcft.org/contract.aspx>.

4. Online Faculty Qualifications

Assignment is the right and responsibility of Management; however, accepting an online assignment is voluntary. When seeking faculty to teach an online or hybrid class, deans may consider the following types of training and experience to determine a faculty member's readiness to teach an online or hybrid class.

- 4.1. The faculty member has completed a course of study in online or hybrid teaching, including those offered at FLC and throughout the district, or a comparable program offered elsewhere.
- 4.2. The faculty member has completed individualized training in teaching in DE modalities.
- 4.3. The currency of the faculty member's experience in online teaching.
- 4.4. Participation in the FLC Online Educators community of practice.
- 4.5. Experience as a student in an online course.
- 4.6. Prior experience teaching a course in a DE modality.

5. Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Online Courses

The process to be used for evaluating online faculty is determined by Article 8 of the LRCFT/LRCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement. The following process for online course evaluation is recommended:

- 5.1. Typically, administrators and peer faculty evaluators meet with the faculty member under review, who demonstrates the online course environment.
- 5.2. Procedures for student evaluation of online faculty are addressed in Article 8 of the LRCCD/LRCFT Collective Bargaining Agreement.

6. Regular Effective Contact

Regular and effective contact, per Title 5, Section 55376, may take place through, but is not limited to, office hours, telephone conversations, email exchanges, course lectures, group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, video conferencing, chat, and/or field trips.

6.1. Regular and effective weekly contact is the responsibility of the instructor to initiate.

6.2 Students should have frequent opportunities to ask questions and receive answers from the instructor of record.

7. Student Support Services

7.1. Accreditation guidelines stipulate that online students have access to the same level of services, support, and assistance as students on campus.

7.2. The Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), California Bills AB422, and AB386, and Section 11135 of the California Codes, require that online students with disabilities have access to the same level of services, support, and assistance as general population students.

C. Future Directions Document

FLC: Future Directions Worksheet

To use the Future Directions Worksheet, please go to “File” and then click “Make a Copy.” This will create a working copy in **your** Google Apps Drive. **By default the shared settings will be set to private!** This worksheet can be shared by you with members of your department (please see the blue “Share” button in the upper right). Information should be entered, shared, and edited by department members)

Remember, in Google docs you don’t need to “save;” all text entered is automatically saved.

When you are done with this document, please add the link to the ADP/PR worksheet in the proper narrative box. Please also share the completed document with the curriculum chair and your dean.

Don’t Forget to update the share settings to ANYONE WITH THE LINK CAN VIEW.

If proposing a new program or certificate, answer each of the questions below. Save your document in Google Docs and provide a link to said document in the Appendix section in your Annual Department Plan or Program Review. Please also forward this document to the curriculum chair and your area dean.

I. Overview and Planning:

Program Name

A. What is the title of your program (this appears in the college catalog). For example, Biological Sciences; Early Childhood Education, Master Teacher; or Theatre Arts: Technical

B. Which department will oversee this program for curriculum/course sequencing, ADP, and Program Review purposes?

Program Type

A. What type of degree/certificate? Input one of the following

Certificate of Recognition (<16 units) NOT submitted to CCCCCO

Certificate of Achievement (8 ≤ units <16) that will be submitted to CCCCCO

Certificate of Achievement (≥16 units)

AS or AA degree (AA-Ts and AS-Ts do not need to complete this document)

Note that certificates must be at least 16 units to be eligible for financial aid.

B. What are the goals/objectives of the program?

CTE (Describe how the program prepares students for the local/regional workforce and if applicable transfer. Provide examples of jobs or job titles, and list transfer programs if applicable.)

Local (Describe how the program prepares students for transfer; basic skills development; civic education; or how it meets a local community and lifelong learning need.)

Communication

A. Describe the efforts undertaken to communicate your desire to develop this program to colleagues in affected departments here at FLC and at each of the other three Los Rios institutions. Describe the efforts to communicate, and summarize the level of support obtained within the district.

B. Describe other similar programs that exist in the region (neighboring community colleges), and any efforts taken to ensure that program service areas do not overlap.

Program Development

A. Where is your department in the development of this program? Has this program appeared in any prior ADP documents? If so, when?

II. Proposed Curriculum

Program Description, Requirements, and PSLOs:

A. Write the proposed program description (what would appear in the college catalog). Also include any prerequisite skills or enrollment limitations, and other student preparation requirements.

B. Write the program student learning outcomes (these can be in draft form).

Courses:

A. In the space below, enter the courses that will comprise the program, including the unit count. Distinguish between required core courses and elective courses. Please indicate which, if any, courses still need to be created.

B. Include a tentative sequence of courses that lead to student completion within two years (i.e. a full-time student), three years, and four years (for part-time students). Include GE areas, and calculate the total number of units (major plus GE) to obtain the degree (assuming no remediation is needed).

Annual Enrollment/Completion:

A. Speculate on the number of students who would earn this degree/certificate annually.

III. Resource Requests (if any):

FTE Needs:

A. Does your department have the FTE necessary to offer this new program? Have there been discussions about reallocating departmental FTE to support this new program? If not, what is your department's plan for acquiring additional FTE? Describe the outcome of conversations with your dean.

Facilities/Equipment/Budget/Professional Development Needs:

A. Please describe any new equipment or facilities that will be necessary for the college to invest in as part of either the development or implementation of this program. Include any necessary requirements for faculty training, ongoing professional development. Include department budget augmentation requirements.

IV. College Goal Alignment:

College Mission and Goals:

A. What specific college need(s) does the development of this program address?
B. How does this program fit the Mission Statement of the college? The college mission is located [here](#). College goals are located [here](#).

Community College Mission and Goals

A. How does this program fit the mission (California Education Code [66010.4\(a\)](#)), curriculum, and master planning of higher education in California?

V. Required Supplementary Documentation:

Career Education Programs

If you are proposing a CTE program, please answer the following related to Labor Market Information: (required by Ed Code [78015](#))

A. Identify specific Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) Codes from Onet <https://www.onetonline.org/>, and list three to five relevant SOC Codes here.

B. Provide answers to the following:

i. Describe the current job market and projections regarding the future job market for graduates of the program. These data should come from the Centers of Excellence per [North Far North Regional Consortium Requirements](#), please work with the CTE dean to complete a [Centers of Excellence LMI request form](#).

ii. Define the geographical regions served by the program.

The job market data should show that the local service area has enough job or promotion opportunities for students who complete the program. Regional, statewide, or national labor market data may also be included, but data from the Centers of Excellence are required for regional justification.

In the event that labor market information (LMI) do not justify the program or insufficient data are available, please include additional justification and/or reasons why the LMI may be misleading. Data sources may come from recent employer surveys, industry studies, regional economic studies, letters from employers in the service area, advisory committee minutes showing a trend in employment over several meetings, job advertisements in the service area, newspaper articles, and/or data from licensing agencies or professional associations.

C. What is the average starting salary for employees in the field? In that field, what is the average percentage of salary increase in 2 years? 5 years?

D. Is there sufficient evidence that employers would preferentially hire or promote graduates with this education, other things being equal? If yes, describe the evidence. How likely is it that applicants with only the education provided by this program and lacking experience, will be hired at all? Or that experienced employees with only this education be promoted? Please explain your answers. If advanced degrees are typically needed for career advancement, will the courses required for this program transfer towards completion of the requirements for those degrees? If yes, describe what programs they will transfer to.

Local programs designed for transfer or to meet community needs:

A. Please include at least one of the following showing alignment with lower division major preparation at a specific baccalaureate institution (CSU/UC):

Programmatic articulation agreements, ASSIST documentation showing that at least 51% of the required courses are articulated for the major at the baccalaureate institution, a crosswalk table showing major requirements at the baccalaureate institution and how the local requirements align (please cite catalog dates and page numbers), a summary of lower division major preparation published or endorsed by professional bodies or accreditors related to the discipline (include citations), formal letters from the baccalaureate institution that verify the program aligns.

D. Program Appraisal and Deletion Process



Folsom Lake College Program Appraisal and Deletion Process

Purpose: To critically appraise a program in order to recommend changes needed to enhance viability, and, if after completing the appraisal process the program remains unviable, to recommend possible discontinuance/deletion.

Initiating Criteria: In order to initiate a proposal for either Program Appraisal or Program Deletion, one or more of the following must apply:

- Declining market/industry demand (local, regional, etc...)
- Advisory board recommendation
- Lack of available resources
- Declining enrollment/productivity trends
- Declining 4-year college/university transfer trends

Note: Trends must be at least three years. The initiating criteria must be documented in the program review, or if the proposal for program appraisal/deletion is not initiated by the department then documentation must be provided to the department involved accompanied by written feedback on the program review report.

Source of Request: A request for Program Appraisal or Program Deletion may originate with any of the following:

- Department or program spokesperson in consultation with department members
- Curriculum Committee faculty chair in consultation with the Curriculum Committee
- Program Development & Planning chair in consultation with the PDP Committee
- Academic Senate President in consultation with Senators
- Vice President of Instruction in consultation with the program's instructional dean or advisory committee

Guidelines:

1. Market/industry demand (local, regional, etc.)
2. Advisory committee recommendations
3. Availability of resources
4. Enrollment/productivity trends
5. Four-year college/university transfer trends
6. Relationships to other campus programs
7. Recent curriculum redesign/changes

8. Trends in course offering/scheduling
9. Trends in diversity of courses
10. Most recent Program Review recommendations
11. Contribution to college and community.

Note: It is the responsibility of the program's faculty (full-time and adjunct) and the program's instructional dean to make necessary information available.

Program Appraisal Process:

Programs are regularly reviewed through the Program Review cycle. Vocational programs undergo Program Review every two years; non-vocational programs every six. Program Review is an internal process that allows departments to assess program effectiveness, appropriateness, relevance, and currency. The Program Review process allows for the provision of commendations and recommendations from the Program Development & Planning Committee and/or the Vice President of Instruction. In the event that more immediate and/or external program appraisal is needed, the Program Appraisal Process may be instituted, as follows:

1. If the source of the request for a program appraisal is not the department, then initial communication must be made informing the department and potentially interested faculty of this process before proceeding.
2. An appropriate source of request, as listed above, based upon the criteria listed above, makes a request to the college Curriculum Committee to initiate a Program Appraisal.
3. The Curriculum Committee reviews the request, confirms initiating criteria, and if in agreement with the Proposal for Appraisal, forwards the proposal to the Program Development & Planning (PDP) sub-committee.
4. PDP uses the guidelines set forth above to evaluate the program.
5. PDP meets with department faculty and the instructional dean to present findings and recommendations, and to set any goals and/or timelines. Faculty or PDP may make requests for additional resources. The findings and requests generated during this meeting are forwarded to the department faculty, Curriculum Chair, VPI, and College President.
6. PDP, the Curriculum Chair, VPI, and department faculty will meet no less than one year later to review progress, and determine if satisfactory progress has been made, if further program appraisal is necessary, or if a proposal for deletion should be initiated.

Program Deletion Process:

1. Using at least one of the initiating criteria set forth above, a written request is made from an appropriate source to initiate a Program Deletion.
2. The Curriculum Committee reviews the request, confirms initiating criteria, and, if in agreement with the proposal, notifies the department faculty, instructional dean, and VPI in writing.
3. If, no less than five days after written notification, there is no faculty opposition to the deletion, then the department faculty initiate a program deletion proposal in SOCRATES that will then go

through the normal curriculum process. The Curriculum Chair forwards the Proposal for Deletion to the Academic Senate, the VPI, and the College President.

4. If a department initiates the request to delete one of its own programs (due to any of the initiating criteria above), steps 1-3 above may be skipped. However, the department must consult with the articulation officer before proceeding further to consider impact on students. Following that consultation, the department votes on its curriculum, and the program deletion proceeds through the normal curriculum process. The department is required to complete the explanation section with justification (including program review data) for deleting the program.
5. In the event that faculty express written opposition to the deletion within five days of notification, the Curriculum Chair will convene a Program Appraisal and Recommendation Team (PART).
 - a. The PART shall consist of five faculty members and two administrators.
 - b. No PART member may be directly involved with the program under review. Individual(s) who were involved in initiating the proposal for appraisal or deletion may not be members of the PART.
 - c. If the program under review is vocational, the five faculty members shall consist of three vocational faculty, one non-vocational faculty, and one counselor familiar with vocational programs.
 - d. If the program under review is non-vocational, the five faculty members shall consist of three non-vocational faculty, one vocational faculty, and one counselor familiar with non-vocational programs.
 - e. All PART faculty will be appointed by the Academic Senate President in consultation with the Curriculum Committee Chair and the PDP Chair.
6. The PART conducts the appraisal using the above guidelines, consults with department and the instructional dean, and notifies the department's spokesperson and instructional dean before sending their recommendation to the Curriculum Committee.
7. The Curriculum Committee schedules a hearing with the department faculty before forwarding a recommendation.
8. The Curriculum Committee chair forwards the recommendation to the Academic Senate, the VPI, and the College President.
9. The College President makes a decision and notifies the Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee and related faculty in a timely manner.
10. If the final decision is to delete the program, either the department faculty or the curriculum chair initiate a program deletion proposal in SOCRATES that will then go through the normal curriculum process.
11. When a program is proposed for deletion, a phase-out plan spanning two years must be developed. The plan must include a sequence of courses to be scheduled over the next two years to allow a final cohort of students to complete degree requirements. Degree auditors and counselors must be informed of the proposal to delete a program and the phase-out plan.

Note: Any request for further information or clarification should be directed to the Curriculum Committee chair for disposition.

E. Course Appraisal and Deletion Process



Appraisal Process for Courses Not Offered in the Past Four Years

Note: This document describes the appraisal process for courses. A different appraisal process exists for programs.

Purpose

The college must submit to the Commission an Annual Report that states the percentage of college courses (as listed in the catalog) for which there is ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. The college must also address course SLO assessment every six years in the Accreditation Self Evaluation. If courses are not offered regularly (at least once every six years), then ongoing assessment cannot happen, and the college is thereby out of compliance with ACCJC standards. Thus the purpose for this process is to ensure that all catalogued courses are offered at least once every six years so as to enable ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes and compliance with ACCJC standards.

Process

1. Each year at the beginning of the spring semester, the Instruction Office will identify all courses that have not been offered in the preceding four years. Courses that appear in the schedule but are later canceled due to low enrollment (or any other reason) will be treated as “not offered.” After compiling this course list, the Instruction Office will send it to the Curriculum Committee chair, area dean, department chair, and full-time department faculty. Departments will then have the next two years to take action regarding listed courses.

2. Departments will have three options to address listed courses.

Option 1: Schedule listed courses at least once during the next two academic years. Courses must be successfully offered (not canceled due to low enrollment or any other reason) in order

to comply with the six-year rule. Departments should follow established schedule development processes.

Option 2: Submit course deletions to the curriculum committee for listed courses that the department does not intend to offer during the next two years. Departments should follow established curriculum course deletion processes.

Option 3: Develop an argument as to why listed courses should remain in the college catalog even though they will not have been offered over a six year period, with the result that course outcomes will not have been regularly assessed, causing the college to be out of compliance with ACCJC standards. Departments should submit their arguments in writing to the Curriculum Committee Chair and the Vice President of Instruction within one year of notification.

3. The Curriculum Committee will address Option 3 arguments during fall of the sixth year. The matter will appear on the Curriculum Committee agenda first as a discussion item, at which time department chairs will be asked to present their arguments. The matter will appear on the next Curriculum Committee meeting agenda as an action item, at which time the committee will vote on the matter. The Curriculum Committee Chair will forward the Committee's recommendation to the Academic Senate, which will then address the matter through its normal processes (discussion item at the first meeting and action item at the following meeting). The Academic Senate President will then forward the Senate's recommendation to the College President.

4. The College President will decide whether courses that have not been offered in six years will remain in the college catalog. If such courses are to be deleted from the catalog, the College President will direct the Curriculum Committee Chair to act as course developer and process deletions through established Curriculum Committee processes.

F. Course Outline of Record with Citations

Course Outline

Folsom Lake College

Los Rios Community College District

Section 1: Curriculum Cycle Information

Course: TEMP 230: Curriculum Basic Skills

Proposal Type: New to District

Faculty Initiator: Eric Wada

Outline Status: 1st Reading

Last Full Review:

Last Curriculum Action: Aug 26, 2015

Official: No

Section 2: Submission Information

Proposal: *To add a course to the FLC catalog that is **not** currently offered by any Los Rios college.*

Explanation:

Section 3: Basic Course Information

Identifier: TEMP 230

Title: Curriculum Basic Skills

Units: 1.00

Prerequisite: None.

[Prerequisite list: None; Special prerequisite: None.]

[Corequisite list: None; Special corequisite: None.]

[Advisory list: None; Special advisory: None.]

Hours:

Description: Curriculum committees are charged with helping faculty design innovative courses and programs to serve students seeking career and/or transfer pathways. As part of our charge, we have to be aware of all laws and regulations surrounding curriculum including local Board policies, California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) guidelines, the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH), Title 5, and the California Education Code. Additionally, we must be aware of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) standards for curriculum. Finally, we also have local policies that we devise.

[Courses embedded in catalog description: None.]

Section 4: Learning Outcomes and Objectives

Upon completion of this course, the student will be able to:

1. slo example 1 (space filler so it appears in TEMP 430).
 2. slo example 2 (space filler so it appears in TEMP 430).
-

Section 5: Course Topics

The topics for this course are typically allocated as follows:

Section 6: Methods of Instruction

Section 7: Typical Student Assignments

Section 8: Evaluation and Assessment Methods

Section 9: Representative List of Textbooks

Section 10: Additional Course Information

Faculty Discipline(s):

Short Title for Transcripts:

Type of Grading:

Letter Grade

Times Taken for Credit:

This course may be taken 1 time for credit.

Enrollment Family:

Not Part of a Family

Cross-listed Courses:

None.

Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) Code:

[\[WARNING! Missing TOP CODE\]](#)

Student Accountability Model (SAM) Code:

[\[WARNING! Missing SAM CODE\]](#)

Section 11: Relationship to College Programs

Need/Purpose for the Course:

**Degrees and
Certificates:**

None.

Prerequisite To:

TEMP 414 and 430

Corequisite To:

None.

Advisory To:

None.

Embedded In Descriptions:

Section 12: Feasibility

Department Planning:

Folsom Lake College Impact:

Los Rios Impact:

Staffing:

Facilities:

Equipment and Supplies:

Essential Library or Media Materials:

Supplementary Library or Media Materials:

Section 13: Digital Signatures

Faculty Initiator: Eric Wada

Department/Subject: TEMP

Department Vote:

Yes: 0

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Total: 0

**Department Chair/
Designated Contact:**

Librarian:

Division Dean: