Proposed Curriculum Committee Structure

**Rationale:**

Because the Curriculum Committee is a Senate Committee, voting members represent, first and foremost, Academic Senate curricular interests, what is best for curriculum and the college from an Academic Senate perspective.

The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee appointees fulfill this role and serve 3-year terms (limited to 2 terms). Appointments of Curriculum Committee faculty members also seek to represent divisions equitably.

Locally, we have decided to add/include division (faculty) chairs for additional representation of and advocacy for faculty (divisions) as well as to include their perspective on curricular matters. It should be noted that while faculty chairs serve 3-year terms, there are no term limits.

In addition, we have decided locally to include as voting members the Articulation Officer, if a faculty member, the Curriculum Analyst as a classified representative, one student representative, and the Faculty Co-Chair (only to break a tie). Like the other AS appointees, the Faculty Co-Chair is subject to term limits (up to two 3-year terms). The AO and CA are on the committee for as long as their role/employment lasts.

Nonvoting members currently include the Administrative Co-Chair (Vice President of Academic Affairs) and instructional deans appointed by the Administrative Co-Chair/VPAA. Their role at the Curriculum Committee meetings is to provide support and advocacy for their division as well as procedural, institutional, and historical knowledge. They have no set terms or limits.

Having administrators vote would shift the emphasis from the AS to the division level by doubling division advocacy. In addition, it doubles administrator authority. Division deans already have the authority and ability to halt curriculum at their review step. Accountability is not affected by their having or lacking a vote (unless the intent is to allow them to exercise their authority over other divisions or to exercise last-minute veto power). Similarly, deans’ advocacy is not impacted significantly by having or lacking the vote. The deans as members have the right to advocate for their division by speaking up on their behalf as knowledgeable representatives having vetted and approved each of the proposals being sent forward through them. Sharing/Voicing that knowledge with the committee seems a much more powerful and meaningful way to advocate for their division than a vote.

The reason for the original deans (to represent credit, noncredit, and CTE courses generally) no longer exists as there is no single dean over all of instruction/credit courses, nor is there one dean over all of noncredit, which is now being offered in a multitude of divisions. Even CTE exists in more than one area, if we consider health occupations/nursing and a few WOEX classes in other areas.

It could be argued that one dean be given a vote to be consistent with one vote for a classified representative and one vote for a student representative. I would argue that the deans have and can exert their authority elsewhere in the process as well as in the institution in a way that classified and students cannot.