RCCD | RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

MORENO VALLEY COLLEGE | NORCO COLLEGE | RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE

# District Academic Standards

## Meeting Minutes

**Thursday, September 3, 2026; 3:00-5:00pm**

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

| Riverside City College | Moreno Valley College | Norco College |
|---|---|---|
| CAK 224 | SAS 101 | ATEC 118 |

| Committee Members | Guests |
|---|---|
| ☒ Nick Sinigaglia (DCC Chair, PHI, MOV) | ☒ Bryan Medina (CPRO, RCCD) |
| ☒ Star Rivera-Lacey (DCC Co-Chair, Deputy Chancellor & Provost) | ☒ Sabina Fernandez (CPRO, MOV) |
| ☒ Kelly Douglass (ENGL, RIV) | ☒ Casandra Greene (CPRO, RCCD) |
| ☒ John Alpay (BUS, NOR) | ☒ Nicole Brown (CPRO, NOR) |
| ☒ Nicole Banerjee (AO, RCC) | ☒ Abril Vega (CPRO, RCC) |
| ☒ Nick Franco (AO, NOR) | |
| ☒ Deanna Murrell (AO, MVC) | |
| ☒ Brock Russell (PHY, RCC) | |
| ☒ Patricia Avila (GUI, NOR) | |
| ☒ Tahmina Morshed (ECON, MOV) | |
| Additional Guests: | |

**Call to Order:** 3:00

**Agenda and Minutes**

1. Approval of Agenda
   Motion: Alpay; Second: Morshed
   Aye: Sinigaglia, Douglass, Alpay, Banerjee, Franco, Murrell, Russell, Avila, Morshed
   Motion Passes

2. Approval of Minutes – May 7, 2026
   Motion: Douglass; Second: Morshed
   Aye: Sinigaglia, Douglass, Banerjee, Franco, Murrell, Russell, Avila, Morshed
   Abstain: Alpay
   Motion Passes

**Discussion & Action Items**

1. Resources for 55001 Compliance – Kelly Douglass
   a. Kelly Douglass provided an overview of the 55001 compliance resources. Additional edits include resources from the Curriculum Institute and from RCC DRC staff. The goal today is to determine if the document is ready for sharing with the curriculum committees and posting to the websites.
   b. Nick Sinigaglia – Thanks to Kelly for making the edits. Memory from Curriculum Institute is that there is a lot of local control over what we require in those fields, is that

correct?
    i. Kelly Douglass – Want to ensure the fields are completed, but there isn't a mandated threshold of content. Title 5 does list specific areas on the COR, but it does seem to be a local decision.
c. Nick Sinigaglia – When equity flex was a topic, many argued for a very high bar. We might want to keep that in mind so that the conversations at curriculum are fruitful.
d. John Alpay – Are we voting to approve this today?
    i. Kelly Douglass – The policy portion was approved in the spring. Perhaps for the resources we can agree by consensus.
e. John Alpay – How will we obtain a final clean copy?
    i. Kelly Douglass – Will clean up and send to the committee.
f. Nick Sinigaglia – This will take effect on October 3, as discussed at Tech Review. None of the current proposals in this cycle will be held to this, but anything launched after October 3 will need to be launched with those fields completed.

2. GESLOs – Nick Sinigaglia
    a. GESLOs are attached to GE courses. When Assessment revised the Critical Thinking GESLO last year, the group repeatedly came across the term Institutional Learning Outcomes as opposed to GESLOs. They are now seeking to rename GESLOs to ILOs. We need to take a stance on this at curriculum as there seems to be an important distinction between GESLOs and ILOs.
    b. Kelly Douglass – When the revision was first presented, neither the District Curriculum Chair nor Senate President understood the intent of the name change to ILO; only understood the desire to revise the Critical Thinking GESLO description. An Institutional Learning Outcome implies every course contributes to the realization of the outcome. That is not what GESLOs are. GESLOs are specific to GE and should be associated with GE courses. Renaming GESLOs to ILOs expands their intent, and could impact not just courses, but student services, classified roles, etc. ILOs are things that everyone in the institution contributes to. GESLOs as written are specifically about educational attainment.
    c. Nick Sinigaglia – Asked Assessment very straightforwardly why they want to make this change, and the response was that ILOs is the term used by other colleges. In the District, it appears ILOs are only referenced in the contract in the description of what constitutes institutional service.
        i. Kelly Douglass – Yes, and if ILOs are referencing institutional service, that is a separate evaluation from our classes.
    d. Patricia Avila – What would be the next step for this body?
        i. Nick Sinigaglia – We should vote on this topic at Tech Review and then let Assessment know. If Assessment then wants to take this to Senate, we could explain Tech Review's concerns.
        ii. John Alpay – Is Tech Review the right committee or would it be DCC?
        iii. Nick Sinigaglia – It could also be this body.
        iv. Kelly – Standards could also take a vote. We are a larger group of people and this body does make policy recommendations. If we were to revise one of the SLOs, Standards would be involved with that work.
    e. Nick Sinigaglia – Will vote at Tech Review as an advisory to Standards. That will be enough to let Assessment what is happening, and Standards can vote if necessary at October.

3. District Academic Standards to non-Brown Act subcommittee

a. Nick Sinigaglia – Been trying to determine the status of this committee for a while. Confirmed with District Senate President that they are waiting on this body to supply the proposal accompanied with a brief rationale.
b. Kelly Douglass – Rationale: We embedded standards in the senate bylaws a few years ago under a previous senate president. At that point we made the membership much more formal, and that is when we defined better what had been past practice: that this body handles matters of policy that extend beyond the scope at a normal Tech Review or DCC. When we vote on things, it's never a final vote. We vote to recommend and then that item goes to DCC if it's a matter of curriculum or Senate of it's a matter of policy. Items may also go to college curriculum. We never take a vote where we are the final vote and this is the rationale for why we don't need to be a Brown Act committee. Our votes are advisory.
c. Nick Sinigaglia – What is it that makes us a Brown Act committee now?
    i. Kelly Douglass – Because we are a subcommittee of a Brown Act committee, but we are a subcommittee of a subcommittee, and we make recommending votes. We never take any official action and should rewrite the Senate bylaws to make that much clearer.
    ii. Casandra Greene – This group could vote in favor of something, but the Senate could override this body. This group just makes recommendations.
d. Nick Sinigaglia – Does this committee have bylaws?
    i. Kelly Douglass – No, because we are subcommittee of the Senate. We don't need our own bylaws.
e. John Alpay – This body is called out in the Constitution, not the bylaws, correct?
    i. Kelly Douglass – Correct.
f. Nick Sinigaglia – Do we need a vote to forward this proposal that we are merely an advisory body?
    i. John Alpay – So we are asking to amend the Senate constitution?
    ii. Kelly Douglass – And including in the description that we are a recommending body and that if it states anywhere that we are a decision-making body that that be removed.
g. Star Rivera-Lacey – If this group sends an official e-mail to her, she will take to legal for their feedback. Current group is responsive. There's a lot of interpretation up and down the state.

4. Open Forum
    a. None

5. Public Comment
    a. None

**Adjournment:** 3:43pm