

District Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 20, 2021 **4:00-5:00pm** **Hosted Via Zoom**

Committee Members	Guests
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Pfeifle (Chair, MVC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lijuan Zhai (AVC Ed Services and Institutional Effectiveness, RCCD)
<input type="checkbox"/> Jeannie Kim (Co-Chair, VC Ed. Services)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Schmidt (MUS, RCC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kelly Douglass (ENG, RCC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Nicol (Staff, RCCD)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Johnson (MAT, NOR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ellen Brown-Drinkwater (AO, RCC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Franco (AO, NOR)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeanne Howard (AO, MVC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sabina Fernandez (Staff, MVC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Casandra Greene (Staff, RCC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicole Brown (Staff, NOR)
Additional Guests:	

Zoom Information

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/98691838351>

+1 669 900 6833 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 986 9183 8351

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of Agenda
 - a. 1st K. Douglass, 2nd B. Johnson
 - b. Add discussion item Update on IGETC/CSUGE
 - c. Approved, Unanimous
2. Approval of Minutes – April 6, 2021
 - a. 1st B. Johnson, 2nd K. Douglass
 - b. Approved, Unanimous

Reports from Colleges - No reports at this time.

Action Items – No action items at this time.

Discussion Items

1. Brown Act and Governor’s Executive Order
 - a. Topic postponed to next DCC.
2. Update on IGETC/CSUGE Approvals – Ellen Brown-Drinkwater
 - a. The CSU Area F approvals were disappointing. For RCC, 19 proposals were

submitted, 10 were approved. For Norco, 8 were submitted, 2 were approved. For Moreno Valley, 14 were submitted, 4 were approved. The Articulation Officers reached out to the CSU office, which indicated that there will be a second review. It appears that many of the community colleges are in a similar situation. Additionally, discipline experts were performing the review instead of the regular general education reviewers, which means they may have been more specifically looking for major preparation rather than general education. Many courses will be resubmitted for the second review.

- b. In the response from the CSU office, there was an indication that the core competencies must be explicit. They may have wanted the exact language from the core competencies – an actual copy and paste of text – rather than any sort of rewording. They also indicated they will allow for back-dating of submissions.
 - i. Nick Franco – This happened with C-ID many years ago where something could have been denied if the exact text was not copied directly into the course information.
- c. Jeanne Howard – The annual convention will take place on Thursday and Friday, so there may be more information at that time.
- d. Jeanne Howard – Another issue was discrepancies in approvals. The same course may be approved at one college and not others.
 - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – The Articulation Officers met and plan to address those discrepancies. Because we are one college and one curriculum, the approvals need to be the same.
- e. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – Updates will be shared at the next college curriculum committee meeting.
- f. Kelly Douglass – Could the AOs investigate what the CSU office means by “explicit”? For English, the competencies were copied directly into the COR, except some were made as objectives and others were made as outcomes. If all of them are required as outcomes, they are creating ASJCC assessment work for faculty.
 - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – It appeared explicit to the AOs, but perhaps the CSUs want the competencies to be highlighted.
 - ii. Ann Pfeifle – Perhaps we need to look at the courses that were approved. For HIS 14 and 15, the core competencies were pasted verbatim into the COR.
 - iii. Kelly Douglass – But for disciplines that blended the competencies into the content, doesn’t this show they were carefully considering the competencies as aspects of the course?
 - iv. Ann Pfeifle – This is a problem with the system itself. An outside group is specifying what our curriculum should be.
- g. Kelly Douglass – For the re-submission, is anything needed from the disciplines?
 - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – The comments provided by the rejections was that the course does not meet three of the five core competencies, and that objectives or student learning outcomes should be added that align with the core competencies. The courses submitted have that information.
 - ii. Nick Franco – Perhaps we should highlight the assist documentation,

- which may be what the reviewers are looking at.
- h. Ann Pfeifle – Do we have a timeline for the re-review?
 - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – Not at this time.

Notice is Hereby Given That Pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20 the Riverside Community College District Curriculum Committee will meet on April 20, 2021 via Zoom Conferencing.

Consistent with Executive Order N-29-20 and Government Code sections 54953.2, 54954.1, 54954.2, and 54957.5, the Riverside Community College District Curriculum Committee will provide to individuals with disabilities reasonable modification or accommodation including an alternate, accessible version of all meeting materials. To request an accommodation, please contact techreview@rccd.edu at least one week prior to the meeting. Requests received after this time will be honored when possible.

Members of the public wishing to comment on an agenda item or other topic within the purview of the Riverside Community College District Curriculum Committee will be given the opportunity via Zoom or may submit commentary to techreview@rccd.edu.