

Update to Course Proposal

The following contains a list and expiation with pictures of suggested changes to the Course Proposal outline in KSCM.

1. The first change is the location of the Start Term drop down menus. These previously did not reside in any section. These will be moved to be in Basic Information. When proposers are completing a modification or proposing a new course this field often gets overlooked as it does not belong within a major section. Moving this field will help make sure this field is completed correctly by the proposer to start with.
2. The Division (2.8) and Review Date (Academic Year) (2.9) are currently both in the General Information section. These are import fields and should reside under Basic Information as this is the first section that is visible when viewing a course outline.

1) BASIC INFO

1) Start Term*

2) Subject Code*

3) Number*
Max 5 characters (5 remaining)

4) Title*

5) Banner Title*
Max 25 characters (25 remaining)

6) Division*
Department responsible for the content of the course. This selection will determine the workflow/approval process used to approve the course proposal.

7) Review Date (Academic Year)*

8) Similar Courses at Other UH Campuses
No Course Matches

9) Similar Courses at UH Campuses with Different Alpha and/or Number
+

3. Remove the Fast Track Question (P.1). This has not been used in KSCM, and often times leads to proposers selecting it by accident. It also does not really provide a “Fast Track” as it only skips the Division Vote. When proposers submit this the Curriculum Committee Chair must withdraw the proposal, change this value to “No” and resubmit it.
4. Remove the GE Question (P.3) as it is not used.
5. Remove the ability to attach documents (P.4) in Proposal Details section. We will still have the ability to attach documents in the Attachments section of KSCM. We do not need two areas to support document attachments.

- Change the Proposal Impact(s) – Program credits question to not ask for details about the change but ask for the number of credits. If there are changes to the number of credits this should be addressed in P.1 Proposal Rational, we just need to know the change in credits.

P) PROPOSAL DETAILS

1) Proposal Rationale*
Summary of proposed change(s). Example: Modifying course description and prerequisites due to current world trends.

2) Other Affected Course(s) And Program(s)
There are no dependencies

3) Proposal Affects Other Departments/Programs*

Yes

No

4) Proposal Impact(s) - Program credits* Credit Change

Increase Credits

Decrease Credits

No change in credits

- In General Information, remove the wordings Cross-Listed from 2.2. Cross-listing is a scheduling issue, not a curriculum concern.
- Also, update the wording in 2.5 to say, “Course is Repeatable for Credit” instead of “Course is Repeatable”.

2) GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Catalog Description*
Course description that appears in the campus catalog. (Please refer to your campus's guidelines regarding the length of the course description)

2) Equivalent Course(s), if Any 3) Display in Catalog*

Yes

No

4) Credit Options*

Fixed

Variable

5) Repeatability

Course is Repeatable for Credit

6) Grading Options*

Audit (A)

Credit/No Credit (C)

Remedial - College Prep (E)

Standard Letter A-F (L)

Credit By Exam (M)

Pass/No Pass (P)

No Grading (X)

7) Schedule Types* 8) Contact Hours Per Week*

Activity Type	Meetings/Week	Hours/Week	Credit Ratio	Contact Hours	Credits
Lecture					<input type="text"/>
Lab					<input type="text"/>
Other					<input type="text"/>

0

9. In Content remove the following question: 4) What evidence exists that the course is taught so that skills are built on what has been learned earlier in the course (or in a previous course) and will lead to what will be learned in a future course? This is already asked in Question 4.3.
10. Remove the three GE Questions: General Education Categories, GE Start Term and GE End Term. These questions are not used in KSCM and add confusion to the proposal process.

4) CONTENT

1) Course Content*
What evidence exists that the course content is appropriate, relevant, and covered in sufficient depth? (addresses breadth, depth, relevancy) What evidence exists that the course reflects current theory and practice in the content area? (address currency)

2) Learning Outcomes*
✚ Add New

3) Justify the level of proposed course*
What evidence exists that the course appropriately covers areas with sufficient emphasis for a remedial, a developmental, or a college-level course? (addresses rigor)

4) Method of Instruction*

11. Update the entire DE Section to better reflect what is required by Accreditation:

5) DISTANCE EDUCATION

1) Does this course have regular and substantive interaction between instructor and student?

Yes

No

Course Not Offered as DE

2) Does this course have regular and substantive interaction between students?

Yes

No

Course Not Offered as DE

3) Distance Education courses will be designed according to the Leeward CC DE Guidelines.

Yes

No

Course Not Offered as DE

Note: Question 2 will be updated to say the following: **Does this course provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction.**