RCCD | **RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

MORENO VALLEY COLLEGE | NORCO COLLEGE | RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE

District Technical Review Committee
Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 2, 2021	2:30-4:00pm	Hosted Via Zoom

Committee Members	Guests
☒ Steven Schmidt (Chair, MUS)	☒ Lijuan Zhai (AVC Ed Services and Institutional Effectiveness, RCCD)
☒ Jeannie Kim (Co-Chair, VC Ed Services)	☒ Bryan Nicol (Staff, RCCD)
☒ Kelly Douglass (ENG, RCC)	☒ Ellen Brown-Drinkwater (AO, RCC)
☒ Brian Johnson (MAT, NOR)	☒ Nick Franco (AO, NOR)
☒ Ann Pfeifle (HIS, MVC)	☒ Jeanne Howard (AO, MVC)
	☒ Sabina Fernandez (Staff, MVC)
	☒ Casandra Greene (Staff, RCC)
	☒ Nicole Brown (Staff, NOR)
Additional Guests: Kinnari Bhavsar	

Zoom Information
https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/94092871087
+1 669 900 6833 (US Toll)
Meeting ID: 940 9287 1087

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of Agenda
    a. 1st A. Pfeifle, 2nd B. Johnson
    b. Add Discussion Item ACC-65
    c. Approved, Unanimous
2. Approval of Minutes – December 1, 2020
    a. 1st K. Douglass, 2nd B. Johnson
    b. Approved, Unanimous

Action Items

1. Curriculum Proposals

Discussion Items

1. Curriculum Handbook Update – Steven Schmidt
    a. Brian Johnson has made edits to the Modifications to Existing Programs section as well as the Emergency DE approval process. The new DE form will be included in part 2 of the handbook. If there are any suggestions, please forward to Brian.

b. Kelly Douglass – The language regarding the Emergency DX Proposals seems vague. Is there a need to be more specific?
　　i. Ann Pfeifle – Perhaps include an asterisk and language that states "As defined by…" or more specific language if needed. DX proposals can cover a wide range of situations, so flexibility in the language may be necessary.
　　ii. Steven Schmidt – These statements in the handbook may also be more descriptive than prescriptive. Being more general may be appropriate.
c. Brian Johnson – Information on Experimental Courses and the COR Review Rubric will also need to be included when ready.
　　i. Kelly Douglass – The language on Experiment Courses is nearly finished. Should this be reviewed at the next Tech Review?
　　　　1. Steven Schmidt – We will agendize the handbook as an action item at the next Tech Review to review all changes.
　　ii. The COR Review Rubric is still in process. Once complete, perhaps the rubric can be posted to the website for faculty to begin using. That will allow for feedback and changes.
d. Ellen Brown-Drinkwater – Are any of the proposal forms going to be reviewed?
　　i. Steven Schmidt – The handbook does not have the actual forms in it. Rather, the handbook links to the forms on the website. The forms can be agendized for the next Tech Review.
e. Steven Schmidt – Part 2 has the updated DE form, but not the DX form. There is a sample DE form with filled fields. Steven will investigate adding additional information regarding the DX form.
f. Steven Schmidt – The handbook includes a process to remove DE, but very few of these types of proposals have come through.
　　i. Brian Johnson – A course doesn't need to be offered as DE if faculty don't want to teach it that way.
　　ii. Bryan Nicol – There's a DE deletion workflow in Meta. He will investigate and e-mail Steven.
　　　　1. Steven Schmidt – It may not contain the specifics we need for the process and may just result in needing another paper form.
g. Steven Schmidt – New videos have been created regarding the new log-in screen and the new search screen.
h. Please provide any edits or changes to Steven and Brian by the end of the week. They will compile the changes by next Wednesday.

2. Out of Class Hours for Select Lab Classes – Kelly Douglass
a. The DAN faculty at RCC have articulated a need for homework hours to be allowed for some of their performance classes. A possible solution of assigning a limited number of homework hours so that the next unit threshold is not met was discussed. Faculty are still frustrated because the correct solution seems to be to set the course up as an activity course, rather than a lab.
b. Have there been historical issues with activity courses? Is there a way we can begin investigating using activity courses? If not, do we have an alternative for how we use lab courses and how we can give better advice?

c. Steven Schmidt – We've never had activity courses in the district. They first appeared in the PCAH and Title 5 between five and eight years ago and were discussed at one of the curriculum institutes. Up to that point, there were only lecture and lab courses. Most music performance courses would also be activity courses because of how the work in the course is assigned, however, there has been no word from the district about offering activity courses and there doesn't appear to be anything in the CTA contract regarding activity courses.

d. Kelly Douglass – There is a section in the PCAH that indicates that activity courses should only be used for certain types of courses, and that their use can threaten articulation for traditional labs. Perhaps in our own handbook we can indicate that activity courses should only be used in certain areas and cannot be used for other disciplines.

e. Kelly Douglass – Created a table that shows the differences in potential homework hours between activity and lab courses. At higher level unit lab courses the course could be extremely limited in the potential homework hours that could be assigned, but perhaps on a class-by-class basis the discipline could choose what would be best for the course.

   i. Steven Schmidt – Most likely, any performance classes will be between 0-3 units. It's rare to have high unit performance courses.

f. Steven Schmidt – When we have a course outline that describes the course content, does the course outline preclude the option of giving homework if it doesn't have homework hours? Are they forced not to give any homework?

   i. Kelly Douglass – Perhaps not, but the COR does communicate an expectation. If we're talking to part-time faculty, the COR is the recommendation. Students may also do more or less than the number of homework hours on the COR.

   ii. Ann Pfeifle – We'll need to be as transparent as possible for part-time faculty. Activity courses could also impact faculty pay.

   iii. Steven Schmidt – In order to articulate to certain institutions, there may be a requirement to show homework.

g. Jeannie Kim – In addition to the contract implementation, there could also be a system issue when it comes to implementing Colleague, and we'll need to ensure that the new ERP is set up appropriately to accommodate activity courses. We would need to determine any differences when it comes to scheduling labs, lectures, and activities.

h. Kelly Douglass – While this may not be a process that is done quickly, who would be the best individuals to begin discussing the process? Would it be the faculty and the dean? If they decide they would like to pursue this option, would this then be followed by the union?

   i. Steven Schmidt – Since this may also impact music courses, Steven would also like to be a part of the conversation.

i. Jeannie Kim – The TA load issue is done by the Chairs and the Deans simultaneously, so having the conversation there makes sense. Jeannie Kim also indicated she would follow up with the VPAAs to ask if they have any historical knowledge about activity courses. Any notes Kelly has would be helpful.

      j.   Kelly Douglass – Request to keep this topic as a rolling agenda item for Tech Review for the time being.

3. Emergency Only DE Status for Fall 21 – Kelly Douglass

      a. Kelly Douglass – Regarding courses that are approved for DX only, when discussed in December, it was understood that the DX would apply for any summer and fall courses if there was any sort of partial closure. Given the current situation, can the curriculum committee draft a short paragraph that states that as long as any college is not 100% back to full capacity that the Emergency DX approvals will continue to apply? Even if there are face-to-face classes across the district, there could still be issues with hybrid scheduling, which would result in some students in class and others at home. Additionally, this appears to be a local decision, and needs to be clearly communicated to department chairs, deans, staff, and others.

      b. Jeannie Kim – The letter that was sent out to RCCD-All regarding the reopening was crafted mainly by the CTA and Academic Senate presidents. This past Friday, there was a meeting with CTA and Senate Presidents, President Steinbeck, Vice Chancellor Kim and Chancellor Isaac. In that conversation the specific question regarding whether the DX approvals would apply for Fall 21 and the Chancellor had stated that they would not apply. However, the curriculum committee should be the one that makes the determination as to whether the DX applies. The logic regarding the application as stated by Kelly Douglass makes sense, and Jeannie Kim stated she would bring that recommendation to Dr. Isaac.

      c. Kelly Douglass – Last spring, one of the concerns regarding DX approvals was the potential to for abuse in a future scenario. The chairs could put together a few sentences that indicate guidance for DX because the current closure due to COVID is on-going and an extremely complex issue.

      d. Steven Schmidt – The emergency proposals were in response to state requirements to show that courses had moved through a DE approval process. Would whether the DX continue to apply be based on what the state requests of us? Does this make it more of a reason that we should clarify the options for fall?

      e. Jeannie Kim – The state has indicated that the emergency designation ended in the fall and that moving into the spring we could not use the emergency designation.

           i. Kelly Douglass – This was regarding apportionment for online courses through fall 2020, but this is different from permission to deliver a class online.

      f. Jeannie – An FAQ with additional information is being put together to help answer some questions. It's important to note that city, county, state, and federal guidelines may also have an impact on re-opening for the fall.

      g. Kelly Douglass – Kelly will draft a statement and will send to the other chairs for review.

      h. Bryan Nicol – Drafted potential timelines for courses to be approved for Standard DE in time for 22WIN/SPR scheduling. He will forward these dates to the chairs.

4. Programs Impacted by Course Unit Value Change – Casandra Greene

    a. A faculty member has indicated the desire to update the units for PSY/SOC-48 from 3 to 4 units. This would impact 15 ADTs and at least 2 degrees at Riverside.

    b. Is there a process to make the course and program updates easier? Who is responsible for reaching out to the various faculty to ensure the appropriate program documentation is obtained?

    c. Steven Schmidt – Could the unit change cause the ADTs to go over the unit maximum?

        i. Casandra Greene – MAT-12 is the equivalent course, which is also 4 units, so it should not have an impact.

    d. Ann Pfeifle – It would appear that the faculty member is responsible for notifying other faculty of that change, and those individuals need to make changes to their program. This is part of the faculty's responsibility. If they would like to enact the unit change, they need to do the appropriate work.

    e. Brian Johnson – Agreement with Ann Pfeifle. Brian routinely warns against unit changes to courses, as it is not as simple as updating the course itself. The faculty member needs to identify everything that is impacted and initiate the modification to those items.

    f. Kelly Douglass – Casandra has already performed some work by identifying the impacted programs, but the faculty should perform the work.

    g. Ann Pfeifle – The faculty member may also not understand the extent of the work involved. Once they understand, it's possibly they may reevaluate the change.

5. ACC-65 – Casandra Greene

    a. A faculty member is seeking to make an update to ACC-65, however, there is a proposal in Meta with an approved status. To launch a draft, the approved proposal would need to be moved to active.

    b. The committee agreed that the faculty member should wait until after May 3, when the proposal will move to active, to launch a new draft. For now, the faculty member should, collect any edits in a word document.

6. Meta Follow Up – Bryan Nicol

    a. Workflow when not a RIV/MOV/NOR Course.

        i. Meta has indicated it would be possible for the RIV Curriculum Chair, MOV Curriculum Chair, and NOR Curriculum Chair to only see the proposals in their queue that are specific to their college. This would result in the chairs only needing to approve the items in their queue that are specific to their college. The users would still be able to search for any proposal in the system, and any user in the Curriculum Committee Member would still see all proposals at the college level in their queue.

        ii. The committee agreed to move forward with the change. Bryan indicated he would request the change be made in the Meta Sandbox first so it can be tested before being applied to production.

    b. Workflow Level Combining

        i. Previously the committee had agreed to combine the levels of district discipline facilitator and department chair. The system is now ready to accommodate this change. Does the committee still want to move forward?

    ii.   Additionally, and potential issue has been identified. If a facilitator sends a proposal back to an originator for updates, it forces the proposal to complete the facilitator and department chair approvals twice.

        1. Steven Schmidt – Do we want the facilitator to be able to send proposals back to the originator? Tech Review should be the first ones to weigh in on the proposal.

        2. After some discussion, the committee agreed that the facilitator role should not be able to send proposals back to the originator and should only have the ability to approve or disapprove a proposal. Whether the proposal is approved or disapproved, it should still continue forward.

    iii. The curriculum chairs agreed to notify the curriculum committees of the change and will notify Bryan at the following Tech Review whether to move forward.

Adjourned at 4:19pm.

Technical Review Notes
Proposals and Notes for 03/02/2021

Courses

Course Inclusions

Code	Title	M	N	R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
APP 450	Apprenticeship Work Experience	☑	☐	☐	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y
TOP code is missing on the APP 450 COR.								
MAT 12H	Honors Statistics	☑	☐	☐	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y

Course Major Modifications

Code	Title	M	N	R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
CMI 61	Introduction to Spanish English Translation	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
For the CMI courses below, the originator is no longer with the district. Ann will work with faculty.								
CMI 71	Bilingual Interpretation for the Medical Professions	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
CMI 81	Introduction to Court Interpreting	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
CMI 91	Introduction to Translation and Interpretation for Business	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FTV 45A	Beginning Television News Production	☐	☐	☑	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y

Course Minor Modifications

Code	Title	M	N	R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
FIT CFO3A	Human Resources Management Chief Fire Officer	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
Holding for course relaunch as major mods.								
FIT CFO3B	Budget and Fiscal Responsibilities Chief Fire Officer	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CFO3C	General Administration Functions Chief Fire Officer	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CFO3D	Emergency Service Delivery Responsibilities	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CO2A	Human Resource Management	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CO2B	General Administrative Functions	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CO2C	Fire Inspections and Investigations	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CO2D	All Risk Command Operations	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT CO2E	Wildland Incident Operations	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT S21	Public Safety Honor Guard Academy	☑	☐	☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y

Courses

Course Minor Modifications

		M N R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
FIT S3A	Introduction to Fire Academy and Physical Conditioning for Fire Academy Students	☑ ☐ ☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
FIT S3B	Firefighter I Academy Skills Review and Certification	☑ ☐ ☐	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y

New Courses

		M N R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
FTV 16	Chicanas/os in Film and Media	☐ ☐ ☑	**Return to Draft**	Y	Y	Y
Returning to draft for further review and development.						
MAG 40	The American Management Association Certified Professional in Management	☐ ☐ ☑	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y
MAT 805	Corequisite Support for MAT-5	☑ ☑ ☑	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
For the MAT support courses below, entrance skill links may need to be adjusted. No minutes attached. The credit version of these courses are not coded as Basic Skills, which creates an issue for non-credit eligibility. The intent was to mirror the support courses. For ENG, ENG-91 was purposefully written as not a Basic Skills course, but ENG wrote a non-credit version that pulls some curriculum from ENG-91 and ENG-50, which was basic skills, in order to make it eligible for non-credit approval.						
MAT 812	Corequisite Support for Math 12	☑ ☑ ☑	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
MAT 825	Corequisite Support for MAT-25	☑ ☑ ☑	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y
MAT 836	Corequisite Support for MAT-36	☑ ☑ ☑	**Hold**	Y	Y	Y

Disciplines

New Disciplines

		M N R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
APP	Apprenticeship	☑ ☐ ☐	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y

Programs

New Programs

		M N R	Action	Douglass	Johnson	Pfeifle
Non-Credit Certificate						
CIS	Remote Work Productivity Essentials	☐ ☐ ☑	**Approved**	Y	Y	Y