

## Common Reasons Syllabi Are Sent Back for Revision

### Local/District Review

1. Incomplete syllabus
  - a. Use the published syllabus template on the CCC website to check for completeness. ICCB/IAI/master and individual syllabi do not necessarily require the same information. ICCB and IAI are specifically looking at curriculum/academic pieces. The departmental master syllabi need to include information outside curriculum but specific to the department and college and agreed upon by the department and college. The individual syllabus should add to the master syllabus material particular to the individual instructor, but match the master syllabus. For example, an instructor may add to the SLOs but not erase any agreed upon SLOs on the master syllabus, and so on.
2. Inconsistent syllabus
  - a. If the SLOs and course description claim that the course is project based or hands-on, then this should also be reflected in the methods of instruction and topical/weekly outline. If there is a lab component, then the labs should reflect the stated SLOs (and IAI is now explicitly requiring this, particularly in the science courses.)
3. Not one clear syllabus in one voice
  - a. A syllabus that clearly looks pasted together or like Frankenstein's monster of bits and pieces suggests that the primary advocate hasn't really thought through the materials and needs to work further on the syllabus.
4. Too specific or too general
  - a. Syllabi need to be up-to-date but also allow for future changes in the discipline. For instance, we ask that textbooks be relatively recent or the most recent edition but, at the same time, be suggested rather than required. Methods of instruction and assessment should allow for instructor variability unless required otherwise. All social science and humanities/fine arts courses for IAI approval, for instance, require at least ten pages of written work, but how the instructor fulfills that requirement varies according to the instructor. Departmental master syllabi should also reflect these distinctions: if all instructors must have students produce a 10 page research paper, then this should be on the master syllabus.
5. SLOs cannot be measured, are too general, or are not reflected in the course objectives, measures of assessments, methods of instruction, or topical/weekly outlines
  - a. SLO measurement can be qualitative as well as quantitative, but the primary advocate may be asked about how this would be done. If the SLO states, for instance, that information literacy is part of the course, then this learning outcome should appear in the weekly/topical outline and so on. There also can be multiple measures of a SLO; "develop an idea from inception to completion" can be demonstrated in a number of ways including research paper, oral presentation, and/or a series of assignments which scaffold a final paper/presentation.
6. Departmental/discipline experts at the other colleges have not been consulted
  - a. On the PAC form, we ask that you get sign off from other colleagues in the District; this is a courtesy to them, an avenue for disciplinary discussions, and for review reasons. If

there is dramatic dissent across the district, we ask for a summary of the issues in the Faculty Council CCC (FC4) Curriculum Committee A /FC4 meetings.

### **IAI Rejection of General Education Courses**

1. Incomplete submissions
  - a. The IAI panels are now asking for more information than in the past, including outlines of lab activities for science courses, clear indications of writing assignments, up-to-date textbooks, and consistency among the parts of the syllabus. Please check [iTransfer.org](http://iTransfer.org) for more information about the particular panel to which you want to apply.
2. Not a general education course
  - a. There are two different possibilities associated with this review. One, there is no comparable general education descriptor available, so it is not eligible for IAI general education number. An example of this is an environmental science course. Things change though, and in the future there may be other descriptors available. The other reason is that the course as presented is not considered general education but a majors course. In the sciences, in particular, the general education course must explicitly differ from a majors course. Again, consult the [iTransfer.org](http://iTransfer.org) site for examples of syllabi which have been approved for GECC.
3. Writing requirement not clearly indicated on the syllabus
  - a. All courses in the social sciences and humanities/fine arts must include at least 10 pages of written work to receive IAI designation. Without this, these courses will be rejected.
4. Did not follow the particular panel's guidelines.
  - a. In the humanities/fine arts, for instance, the panel requires a focus on cultural/historical aspects of the humanities and will reject what they think of as a skills focused course. Foreign language 104 is under review for this very reason.
5. Five-year review
  - a. At this point (August 2013), IAI only has electronic copies from 2005 forward, so when a course is reviewed (for continuous IAI approval), it is not compared to the original; instead, the panelists use the current syllabus for review. This may change.