

District Academic Standards

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, December 7, 2023; 3:00-5:00pm

<https://rccd-edu.zoom.us/j/82506905881?pwd=ejYySWlrGjzRGoxa1k5YVJlT0dQQT09>

Riverside City College CAK 202Q	Moreno Valley College SAS 101	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 type="checkbox"/> Sabina Fernandez (CPRO, MOV)
<input checked="" 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"/> Jeanne Howard (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: Amanda Brown, Cynthia Outlaw	

Call to Order: 3:04pm by Ann Pfeifle

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of Agenda
 Motion: K. Douglass; Second: E. Brown-Drinkwater
 Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – Request to amend the agenda, postponing discussion item 1 until the spring meeting.
 Approved, Unanimous

2. Approval of Minutes – November 2, 2023
 Motion: B. Johnson; Second: J. Howard
 Approved, Unanimous

Discussion Items

1. RCCD Policy on Acceptance of Credit from Companies such as Straighterline, Study.com with ACE Recs – Ellen Brown-Drinkwater
 - a. Postponed until spring meeting.

2. Area of Emphasis Catalog Formatting – Bryan Medina
 - a. Bryan Medina provided a list of example AOE's with formatting to delineate courses offered at a specific college and courses offered at other colleges. The formatting may be confusing for students.

- b. Kelly Douglass – Would marking courses with an asterisk and notating that those courses are offered at other colleges be ADA compliant?
 - i. Bryan Medina – Believes so.
 - c. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater, Jeanne Howard, and Nick Franco stated they believe the current formatting is not confusing for students. Notating each course and where they are offered could lead to an increased workload towards keeping the catalog and advising sheets updated.
 - d. The committee discussed adding the following language to each of the AOE:
 - i. “Not all courses listed in the Area of Emphasis degree are offered at all three colleges; please check your college catalog to see if a course you are interested in is offered at your college.”
 - e. Nick Sinigaglia – One concern is that we are still requiring students to perform some work to identify which courses are offered at their college.
 - f. Felipe Galicia – If there is documentation showing the list of programs and courses available to the students, that should be provided to them.
 - g. Jeanne Howard – Students should also be working with counselors.
 - h. The committee agreed to add the above language to each of the AOE in the catalog.
3. Interdisciplinary Degree Council – Kelly Douglass
- a. Kelly Douglass and Nick Sinigaglia drafted a recommendation for an interdisciplinary council for interdisciplinary degrees, which would seek to solve the lack of ownership of the degrees. The council would be charged with performing manual content review, reviewing inclusions and exclusions of courses, updating narratives and PLOs, and would act in the same way as a discipline would for a single-discipline degree. The recommendation is based off a process that was shared by an Academic Senate President from another district.
 - b. Kelly Douglass – Each council could have a chair. The chair should be a member of the curriculum committee, but council members do not necessarily have to be. The council should have representation for each discipline in the degree. There should be a clear invitation to faculty members to participate, but the invitation would be opt-in only. If faculty from a discipline do not participate, then the participating members from other disciplines would ultimately perform the work.
 - c. Kelly Douglass – Should there be one council member per discipline, or should the number of council members be proportional to the number of courses in the program?
 - i. Ann Pfeifle – Proportional representation makes sense.
 - ii. Nick Sinigaglia – Some courses are never offered. Should it be proportional to the number of sections scheduled?
 - iii. Kelly Douglass – If the concern is that the larger discipline is going to vote another discipline off a degree, then some input from the discipline should be required as a part of the proposal. That proposal could then go to the curriculum committee for the committee’s vote.
 - d. Nick Franco – Is the council made of faculty from all three colleges?
 - i. Kelly Douglass – There would be a council at each college. Each council would

- have a single vote per college similar to disciplines now.
- e. Nick Franco – Could this make the work less efficient? For the SJS ADT, for example, a state-wide group of faculty met to determine the TMC.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – The difference between the TMC and ADT is that the faculty decided the courses included in the final degree, as opposed to allowing any courses that qualifies. At Riverside, faculty assembled to create the SJS degrees, so this proposal just formalizes the process they followed. Norco, alternatively, has the SJS discipline.
 - ii. Ann Pfeifle – This group would also be ad hoc and only assemble when needed.
 - f. Ann Pfeifle – Submission deadlines should follow the regular curriculum calendar, with a launch deadline in the fall.
 - g. Kelly Douglass, Nick Sinigaglia, and Bryan Medina will review some specific degree examples, draft actual directions/instructions, and will bring this topic back in March.
4. Title 5 General Education Pattern – Kelly Douglass
- a. The general education plan was passed as presented by a 2-to-1 vote, with Moreno Valley and Riverside voting to approve the plan, and Norco voting to approve the plan with modifications.
 - b. Kelly Douglass – Concerns have been expressed by members of the academic senate and other faculty regarding a potential overreach by Standards, the short timeline in which the pattern was approved, and that there was not enough input from faculty on the general education pattern. Additionally, there were times in reporting to Senate where it was not clear if the report was coming from a representative of the curriculum committee or standards. Additional concerns include the removal of the American Institutions area, as well as the reduction of units in the Social and Behavioral Sciences area from 6 units to 3 units. We did not have substantive discussions on these changes. Lastly, there was a concern regarding the removal of CIS-1A from the general education pattern. On what authority did Standards make this decision? Was this a curriculum decision?
 - i. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – In evaluating the updates to Title 5, CIS-1A may be a course that fulfills analytical thinking in the old language, but may not fulfill quantitative reasoning in the new Title 5 language. Creating a draft of the general education pattern and providing that to the curriculum committees and senate as a recommendation is not an overreach.
 - ii. Ann Pfeifle – Agree that providing a draft and providing it as a recommendation is not an overreach.
 - iii. Jeanne Howard – We did have conversations regarding the draft, the removal of courses, and we did provide that as a recommendation. If courses need to be added in, we can have that discussion and send forward another draft.
 - c. Kelly Douglass – Perhaps there was an order of operations mistake due to the lack of timing caused by the chaptering of the Title 5 language.
 - d. Jeanne Howard – The District also does not have a general education committee. There was one previously that did vote on changes to the pattern. Standards should be the committee to make recommendations on general education.

- e. Clara Lowden – The vote was pushed too fast through the process.
 - f. Kelly Douglass – Absent of any guidance from the State Chancellor’s Office, we must meet catalog deadlines.
 - g. The committee discussed the following timeline and process:
 - i. **February 27** – College Curriculum Meeting: Collect any concerns from the committee regarding the general education pattern for additional discussion at Standards.
 - ii. **February 29** – Special Standards Meeting: Invite faculty to attend to provide additional information as needed. Standards to make a recommendation on the general education pattern and to itemize any concerns to take to the curriculum committee for a vote.
 - iii. **March 12** – College Curriculum Meeting: The committee should vote on any itemized concerns and the general education pattern.
 - iv. **March 18** – Special Academic Senate Meeting: For discussion and a vote of approval on the general education pattern.
 - v. **March 19** – District Curriculum Committee: The District Curriculum Committee can finalize the votes based on the votes that took place at the College Curriculum Committee.
 - vi. **March 20** – Report preparation for the Cabinet and Board of Trustees.
 - vii. **March 25** – Anticipated Cabinet date for the April Board of Trustees meetings.
 - viii. **April 2 and April 16** – Anticipated dates of the Board of Trustees Committee and Regular meeting respectively.
 - ix. **April 17** – General education pattern published to catalog.
 - h. Ann Pfeifle will draft a letter to the curriculum representatives to inform them that additional discussion on the general education pattern will take place in the spring. Curriculum representatives should be working with their disciplines and departments to collect any concerns and to bring those concerns to the curriculum meeting on February 27 for discussion.
 - i. The committee discussed whether Standards is a standing committee of the District Curriculum Committee or the District Academic Senate. The committee historically has been a standing committee of the Senate. There is language on the District website that should be updated.
5. Open Forum
- a. This will be Jeanne Howard’s final meeting with Standards. In the spring, Deanna Murrell will be taking on articulation officer responsibilities for Moreno Valley.
6. Public Comment for all items on or not otherwise on the agenda.
- a. None.

Adjournment: 4:56pm