

## District Academic Standards

### Meeting Minutes

**Thursday, February 29, 2024; 3:00-5:00pm**

<https://rccd-edu.zoom.us/j/82506905881?pwd=ejYySWlreGJzRGoxa1k5YVJiT0dQQT09>

Riverside City College CAK 224	Moreno Valley College SAS 303	Norco College OC 116	District Office CAADO 209
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

Committee Members	Guests
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Pfeifle (DCC Chair, HIS, MOV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Medina (CPRO, RCCD)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Mills (DCC Co-Chair, VC Ed Services)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sabina Fernandez (CPRO, MOV)
<input type="checkbox"/> Brian Johnson (MAT, NOR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Casandra Greene (CPRO, RIV)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kelly Douglass (ENG, RIV)	<input type="checkbox"/> Nicole Brown (CPRO, NOR)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ellen Brown-Drinkwater (AO, RCC)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Franco (AO, NOR)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deanna Murrell (AO, MVC)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clara Lowden (KIN, RIV)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Sinigaglia (PHI, MOV)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Martin (GUI, NOR)	
Additional Guests: Paul Conrad, Amanda Brown, Jude Whitton, Janet Lehr, Matt Fast, Joanie Gibbons-Anderson, Scott McLeod, Ana Marie-Olaerts, Cliff Ruth, Valerie Merrill, Sean Drake, Tim Mount, Juan Ahumada, Felipe Galicia, Maurice Bowers, Toni Rangel	

**Call to Order:** 3:04pm

**Agenda and Minutes**

1. Approval of Agenda  
Motion: K. Douglass; Second: E. Brown-Drinkwater  
Approved, Unanimous
  
2. Approval of Minutes – December 7, 2023  
Motion: K. Douglass; Second: C. Lowden  
Approved, Unanimous

**Discussion Items**

1. RCCD General Education Pattern Updates, Amendments, and Discussion
  - a. Kelly Douglass – Curriculum representatives were instructed to let disciplines and departments know about the expanded timeline for amendments to the RCCD GE pattern. At today’s meeting, the intent is to collate, align, and consider the recommendations from the three committees. At the March 12 College Curriculum meetings, the committees will be presented with itemized lists of amendments for vote.
    - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – Understood that Standards would create the structure of the degree and an up-or-down vote would take place at this meeting regarding proposals to send draft back to curriculum for vote.

- ii. Kelly Douglass – Standards is a recommending body, and a qualitative decision is beyond a recommendation. The curriculum committees will be given the opportunity to vote yes or no. General Education modifications always go to the curriculum committees.
  - b. Felipe Galicia – Is there a process for general education modifications?
    - i. Kelly Douglass – There is a process to add or remove courses from the GE pattern. What we are doing today is aligning with updated Title 5 language according to legislation imposed upon us.
    - ii. Jennifer Floerke – Is this the process moving forward? Does this set precedent?
    - iii. Kelly Douglass – We are not setting precedent; we are following precedent. When there are structural changes to a degree, it comes to Standards and then to the curriculum committee with a recommendation. Standards is charged with making recommendations to both Curriculum and Senate.
    - iv. Ann Pfeifle – In the past, Standards has reviewed mandates from the State Chancellor’s Office or legislation that impact all students and faculty.
  - c. Kelly Douglass – Additionally, while AB928 created CalGETC and the need to auto-enroll students interested in transfer into an ADT, these are not topics for today. The discussion is on the two-year terminal degree and the students who seek that degree and do not intend to transfer.
    - i. Nick Sinigaglia – There is nothing in Title 5 that mandates we align with CalGETC?
    - ii. Kelly Douglass – Correct. The areas were design to align with CalGETC, but CalGETC is 34 units, and the Title 5 minimum requirements are 21 units.
  - d. Valerie Merrill – Is the intent to day to recommend a plan that is taken back to the curriculum committees for a vote?
    - i. Kelly Douglass – We have a general education plan approved in December 2023. Today we are weighing amendments to that plan and where they align with Title 5. Our intent is to give contextualized choices to the curriculum committees.

## **1. Proposal from CIS: Addition of CIS-1A to Area 2**

The committee and guests discussed the proposal to add CIS-1A to Area 2. Faculty members of the CIS discipline provided examples of quantitative reasoning concepts found throughout the course.

The Standards Committee discussed the requirements of the area as outlined by Title 5 and concerns about the amount of content in the COR that appeared to directly reflect quantitative reasoning concepts, including within the description, content, SLOs, and objectives. A question was raised whether the mathematical concepts taught within the course are equivalent to college level math.

Members of the CIS discipline explained that concepts related to Excel, Access, SQL, formulas, and functions are prevalent throughout the entirety of the course, including the lab, and that students are taught theory and then apply that theory within the course. Additionally, members of the CIS discipline explained that no COR explicitly states what percentage of the course is made up of each topic on the COR.

Motion by Kelly Douglass to forward the proposal to the curriculum committees without a recommendation from Standards in favor or against the proposal;

Second: Ellen Brown-Drinkwater

Approved, Unanimous

## **2. Proposal from MAT: Removal of CIS 14A, CSC 14A, CSC 8, CIS 18A, CSC 18A, and CIS 30A from Area 2**

The committee discussed that the general education pattern was previously approved in the fall term with the courses in Area 2 and that the Title 5 language does allow for courses in computer languages. These courses appear to explicitly be computer programming courses.

Members of the MAT discipline explained concerns regarding whether the courses that specifically teach Python and Java appropriately contained quantitative reasoning concepts equivalent to the same level as C++.

Members of the CIS discipline explained that Java and Python are high level programming languages.

Motion by Kelly Douglass to forward the proposal to the curriculum committees with a recommendation to not approve the proposal;

Second: Clara Lowden

Approved, Unanimous

## **3. Proposal from HIS: Creation of an American Institutions Area**

Members of the HIS discipline explained that many other institutions require a course that fulfills some sort of topic related to citizenship in order to graduate. That area has disappeared in the new pattern.

The committee discussed concerns regarding adding additional units and additional requirements to the plan and the impact on students and their financial aid. The committee also discussed that American Institutions is no longer a part of CSUGE, IGETC, or CalGETC, but is instead a four-year graduation requirement that can be taken either before or after transferring.

Motion by Ellen Brown-Drinkwater to forward the proposal to the curriculum committees with a recommendation to not approve the proposal;

Second: Clara Lowden

Approved, Unanimous

## **4. Proposal from HIS: Addition of HIS Courses to the Arts and Humanities Area**

Members of the HIS discipline explained that at many other institutions, HIS courses can be found in either the Arts and Humanities area or the Social and Behavioral Sciences area.

The committee discussed that with the exception of HIS-1, 2, and 2H, the HIS courses in question are not in the 23-24 RCCD Humanities area, and were therefore not included in the proposed 24-25 Arts and Humanities area. However, the HIS discipline can follow the regular general education modification procedure to propose them for inclusion into the 24-25 RCCD general education pattern.

Motion by Kelly Douglass to not forward the proposal to the curriculum committee;

Second: Nick Sinigaglia

Approved, Unanimous

## **5. Proposal from COM to Modify Area 1 by Creating Area 1B: Oral Communication and Area 1C: Critical Thinking**

The committee discussed the concern of adding additional units and requirements to the program, and that while there is an effort to align the local degree with CalGETC, it does not have to be an exact match. The committee also discussed that based on the updated structure of the GE pattern, more students may take COM courses as there are now fewer courses that fulfill requirement, with most of them being in the COM discipline.

Members of the COM discipline explained how oral communication is specifically detailed in both the purpose of the Associate Degree and the Institutional Learning Outcomes. The question was raised of whether students are obtaining oral communication skills if oral communication is only a choice in the general education pattern.

Motion by Clara Lowden to forward the proposal to the curriculum committees with a recommendation to not approve the proposal;

Second: Kelly Douglass

Approved, Unanimous

### **Additional Discussion**

1. Kelly Douglass – The above items should be forwarded as action items to the March 12 Curriculum Committee meeting, but should be provided to the committee members as soon as possible to allow for discussion. We should communicate to the committees that Standards reviewed the proposals under the principal that the local RCCD general education pattern is intended for terminal 2-year degrees and not for transfer. While it fits within the CalGETC framework, the local pattern does not have to be an exact match. Standards considered the merits of each proposal, but also considered the potential for unit overload and its impact on students.
2. Timeline for Approval:
  - a. March 12 – College Curriculum Meeting
  - b. March 18 – Special District Academic Senate Meeting
  - c. March 19 – District Curriculum Committee Meeting; Once approved, will be routed to the Board of Trustees.
3. Open Forum
  - a. Kelly Douglass – Thanked the committee and guests for their hard work.
4. Public Comment for all items on or not otherwise on the agenda.
  - a. None

**Adjournment:** 4:57pm