

District Academic Standards

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, December 4, 2025; 3:00-5:00pm

<https://rccd-edu.zoom.us/j/82506905881?pwd=ejYySWlrGjzRGoxa1k5YVJiT0dQQT09>

Riverside City College CAK 224	Moreno Valley College SAS 101	Norco College OC 116
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------

Committee Members	Guests
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kelly Douglass (DCC Chair, ENGL, RIV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Medina (CPRO, RCCD)
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Vacant</i> (DCC Co-Chair, VC Ed Svs)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sabina Fernandez (CPRO, MOV)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Sinigaglia (PHI, MOV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Casandra Greene (CPRO, RIV)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Johnson (MAT, NOR)	<input type="checkbox"/> Nicole Brown (CPRO, NOR)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicole Banerjee (AO, RCC)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Franco (AO, NOR)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deanna Murrell (AO, MVC)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brock Russell (PHY, RCC)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Patricia Avila (GUI, NOR) <i>Attended remotely as a guest.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Moreno Valley Representative</i>	
Additional Guests: Star Rivera-Lacey, Lijuan Zhai	

Call to Order: 3:08pm

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of Agenda
Motion: Sinigaglia; Second: Johnson
Approved, Unanimous

2. Approval of Minutes – November 6, 2025
Motion: Sinigaglia; Second: Johnson
Approved, Unanimous

Discussion & Action Items

1. Title 5 Updates to the COR
 - a. Kelly Douglass provided an overview of the policy documentation drafted by Kelly, Brock, and Bryan. The policy states that the disciplines must have a discipline-wide discussion/process to ensure all courses describe approaches to engage and support all students and advance equitable outcomes. Faculty will detail that process, and where those elements are embedded into the COR (in the MOI and MOE specifically, but faculty may choose other areas), in a required field in Curriquet. That field can then print to Tech Review and College Committee agendas so that it is integrated into the review process and is a part of our public documentation.
 - b. The next steps, as discussed at the previous Standards meeting, is to take this document

- to the curriculum committee in February for discussion, and then to take it to the Tech Review committee.
- c. Nick Sinigaglia – Do we need a second required field for the universal design piece?
 - i. Kelly Douglass – There should be a parallel process.
 - ii. Bryan Medina – May want have has few additional fields on the form as possible.
 - iii. Kelly Douglass – We should discuss this with the college curriculum committee for their feedback.
 - iv. Bryan Medina – Will need the number of fields and the specific guiding text we want to include in the form in Curriqnet. Generally, we should expect that the request will take a couple of months to complete, but there’s nothing to stop the faculty from doing the work now. Eventually, they would just need to update those fields when they are available in the system.
 - v. Kelly Douglass – Guiding text could say, “Where in your COR do you reflect equity and inclusion practices, and how did your discipline arrive at those policies/procedures/pedagogies, etc.” The UDL language could say “Where in the COR do you reflect universal design?” because title 5 does not require that we ask for the process. We can finalize language in February.
 - d. Nick Sinigaglia – Should we specify the length of the narrative we are requesting? This will help keep the length of agendas manageable.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – Maybe a sentence that tells us where to look in the COR for the elements, and then a couple of sentences that describe the discipline’s process.
 - e. Nick Sinigaglia – The policy document uses the word “changes,” but some disciplines have already done the work and now just need to cite where the elements are in the COR.
 - i. Kelly will revise the document.
 - f. Nick Sinigaglia provided an overview of the documentation drafted by Nick and Deanna. They met with the three DRC directors who agreed there should be general language in the COR verifying that we meet all the basic accessibility requirements for any electronic materials. There is also a list of common UDL elements the disability services coordinators are going to work on, and we should have a list of resources sometime in February. These elements should also appear in MOE and MOI, and potentially the course content and materials.
 - g. Nick Sinigaglia – Based on the reading of the title 5 language from the DRC staff, it sounds as though courses need to be restructured such that adjustments are no longer needed in the future. We are trying to eliminate what students need adjusted by structuring the course around their needs.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – There appears to be standardized language in the documentation. What if faculty don’t do that? Is that more of a requirement than what we’re being asked to do?
 1. Nick Sinigaglia – The requirement already exists; the language is just not in our CORs. The idea is that putting the language in will help to fulfill part of the title 5 language. Tried to write the language in a way that specified it is a requirement if electronic materials exist for the course.
 - h. Kelly Douglass – Concerned about the title 5 changes changing the mission of the curriculum committee. It has never been our job to document accessibility procedures.
 - i. Brock Russell – The language states to guarantee “through the course outline of record,” so if the COR reflects the updates, then we are complying with title 5.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – There is an anticipated update to the PCAH that should have additional guidance in the spring.
 - i. Nick Sinigaglia – This is the best we can do now, and the sooner we establish the

policy, the sooner the faculty can do the work.

- j. Deanna Murrell – Should we include check boxes in the COR Review Tool to help guide faculty through the process?
 - i. Kelly Douglass – We can, but the COR Review Tool is not a required document for the approval process.
 - k. Nick Sinigaglia – Will we accept if they are representative practices, although the practices may not be in every section? Or are we looking for things that show up in every section?
 - i. Brock Russell – MOI and MOE are always representative and not required.
 - l. The documentation will go to the College Curriculum Committees in February for discussion and input, and then will be brought to the Tech Review committee.
2. Discipline Control of Curriculum / CAT/CIS Exclusions

Current MVC Policy:

Per state requirements, ADT program outlines may contain only courses from our catalog. For all other programs, degree and certificate, MVC Curriculum follows this local rule: an MVC program may include RCC or Norco courses not in our catalog as long as it is possible to complete the program with MVC courses alone, i.e., any required courses are in our catalog and each elective category lists MVC courses sufficient for a student to choose from them alone and still reach the unit requirement for the category. For courses not in our catalog, faculty responsible for a given program will regularly inform affected students about planned offerings at RCC and Norco. These faculty must also inform their discipline colleagues at RCC and Norco whenever a curriculum change results in a course in an MVC program not being in our catalog. Lastly, MVC Curriculum will work with the relevant faculty to ensure that any deletion proposals for such courses originating from RCC or Norco are not delayed pending modification to MVC programs.

- a. Nick Sinigaglia – At MVC, there was concern regarding disciplines wanting to launch exclusions/deletions that get held up due to the course being a part of programs or prerequisites for other disciplines. The above is the policy that MVC developed, and its intent was to be more restrictive than the District policy. We are looking for a way to compel disciplines to perform modifications so as to not hold up the curriculum work of other disciplines. If faculty are not performing the work they need to, we need a way to override it. Would like the curriculum committee to have the authority to make those changes.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – Concerned about establishing a concrete rule where we tell faculty what to do. The problem historically seems to have been faculty just not completing the paperwork.
 - ii. Nick Sinigaglia – There are instances of faculty refusing to take a vote and perform the modification. Requiring a vote tells faculty they have a choice in the decision.
 - iii. Kelly Douglass – We could expand the current course exclusion form to include a series of questions regarding impact and notifying other disciplines. If a course is an elective in a program, they should have a compelling reason for retaining it in the program. Expanding the form would give more information to Tech Review as we review proposals. For faculty who are not complying, we may need to go to the Academic Senate and the VPAA for assistance.
 1. Nick Sinigaglia – Concern about involving administration in curriculum.
 2. Kelly Douglass – They are the administrative co-chair.

3. Nick Sinigaglia – Why is this preferable to the curriculum committee?
- iv. Brian Johnson – Perhaps the discipline gets notified and we give them a certain amount of time, and if they don't comply then the course exclusion or deletion moves forward. If the program is wrong, it is on the faculty to make the modification.
 1. Kelly Douglass – Concern that the catalog is now inaccurate.
 2. Brian Johnson – This is part of the risk of having a course in your program that does not belong to your discipline.
 3. Kelly Douglass – We are now negatively impacting the student.
 4. Brian Johnson – We aren't impacting the student, the discipline is.
 5. Kelly Douglass – It should be the job of the curriculum chair to automatically do a course inclusion. It is a problem having a program in the catalog when we know the information is wrong.
 6. Brian Johnson – If you are forcing an inclusion, you are forcing an unrelated discipline at that college to have a course and offer it, which doesn't impact the program discipline. The responsibility is on the discipline with the program.
 7. Nick Sinigaglia – Agree, which is why the curriculum committee should have the ability to modify the program.
 8. Kelly Douglass – Concerned about having faculty who would then never update their programs and would rely on the curriculum committee to do it for them.
- b. Nick Sinigaglia – We're in a position where a discipline wants to delete a course, and we need to undo the associated cross-listing. We want to take that to the curriculum committee.
 - i. Kelly Douglass – Does the curriculum committee have the authority to do that?
 - ii. Deanna Murrell – The nuance is that the cross listing happened before we had the ETS faculty in the college and ETS faculty say the courses do not fit ETS and are not appropriate for the program.
 - iii. Kelly Douglass – If individual faculty are not doing their job, then we need support from the Senate and the VPAA. Concerned about building into our process rules for specific individuals not doing their job.
- c. Kelly Douglass – Will draft a change to the exclusion form and bring it back in the spring for Standards to review.
- d. Kelly Douglass – Regarding MVC's policy, establishing that language as a policy takes a general exception and now makes it a norm, and it may make including courses not at your college into a program occur more than is necessary. A policy like this drafted at MVC does have an impact on the other colleges. MVC choosing to exclude courses but maintain them in their programs is an MVC choice, but that impacts the decisions made by the other colleges when they want to modify courses.
 - i. Deanna Murrell – Part of this was due to courses not being offered by the college. Many of the courses were not offered for five or more years, which is a problem for students. A huge part of the MVC policy was also to bring awareness to faculty that they need to offer these courses.
 - ii. Nick Sinigaglia – And in some cases the issue was that we simply couldn't offer them. The way the MVC policy is written, there should never be a time where a student must take a course outside of MVC to complete the program.
 - iii. Casandra Greene – There appeared to be instances where retaining the courses were very intentional, but other instances where we saw almost an entire section of courses now only being offered at RCC.

- iv. Sabina Fernandez – We have met with that faculty member who is revising the program. She is replacing the category with a course that is offered at MVC, and that modification will come forward soon.
 - e. Kelly Douglass – More of a guided process on the exclusion form will be helpful. There are other districts that don't have common curriculum and they have to seek articulation between the colleges. We have a gift with our curriculum, so we need to find a good balance.
 - i. Nick Sinigaglia – Perhaps include a rationale as to why retaining a course is a good idea?
 - ii. Casandra Greene – Yes, to ensure it is a thoughtful and intentional decision in the best interest of students.
 - iii. Nick Sinigaglia – Agree, we should not be including electives throughout the District unless it is intentional.
3. Open Forum
- a. None.
4. Public Comment
- a. None.

Adjournment: 4:39pm

Policy for complying with Title 5 §55001 relating to equity and inclusion:

“§55001 (b) Curriculum committees shall have a documented procedure for ensuring that course outlines of record for all courses approved pursuant to section 55002 describe approaches that would accommodate and engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students.”

Faculty will engage in a robust discipline-wide process/discussion to ensure that all courses approved under §55002¹ describe pedagogy approaches faculty may use to engage and support all students and advance equitable student outcomes.

At RCCD, the results of these discussions will be reflected in the methods of instruction and evaluation on the Course Outline of Record (and potentially other sections such as content or course materials as well) in the context of the discipline and specific course in which they are included.

Faculty originators will record in a required field in Curriqnet² what areas of the COR, which must include Methods of Instruction and Evaluation, directly address §55001 (b) [and(c), Nick?] and by what process the discipline arrived at these approaches.

All courses in RCCD catalogs must reflect these changes and additional components by the Fall 2030 catalog (Fall 2029 launch deadline).

¹ (all credit (degree applicable and non-degree applicable), noncredit, and community services courses)

² This field will print to all curriculum agendas along with the rationale field through at least Fall 2030 but will not print to the actual COR.

Resources for faculty complying with 55001(b)

To assist faculty with COR revisions and documentation of their processes, the College Curriculum Committees and Academic Standards Committee offer faculty the following resources, discussion prompts, and discipline review procedures to use in addition to or in lieu of any discipline-specific resources:

- Equity-Minded Curriculum COR Review Questions from our current [*COR Review and Equity in Curriculum Development Tool*](#)³:
 - Has the discipline had a conversation about how to ensure that equity is visible in the COR as a priority? Two more comprehensive resources you might consider:
 - [Glendale Community College's Guide for Creating Equitable Curriculum](#) (see page 7 in particular for additional prompts for thinking about Methods of Evaluation and Student Learning Outcomes);
 - [Portland State University's Culturally Responsive and Inclusive Curriculum Resources](#) which includes both general guiding questions and discipline specific resources for STEM, Social Sciences, and Humanities fields.
 - Do the course materials reflect multiple perspectives and contributions to the field, including those of scholars from previously minoritized groups as well as representative of RCCD's student population?
 - Do methods of instruction and sample assignments offer opportunities for students to build on existing knowledge or experience as relevant to the class and provide opportunities to explore culturally relevant and inclusive texts and topics?
 - Do methods of instruction and evaluation and sample assignments offer opportunities for students to develop and practice skills needed for later advanced academic tasks on which they will be evaluated?
- There are many different types of evidence-based teaching practices (EBTPs) that advance equity in the classroom. Below are some resources with details about such practices:
 - [AAC&U High-Impact Practices](#)
 - [EBTPs from Every Learning Everywhere](#)
 - [Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation Teaching Resources](#)

³ Renamed from COR Review Tool by DCC in November 2025

From Title V: Curriculum committees shall have a documented procedure to guarantee accessibility for every student to ensure individuals with disabilities can equally participate in learning through course outlines of record that reflect Universal Design for Learning strategies, which include multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression to support learner variability and diversity.

-Include a prompt in minutes report or elsewhere so committee knows where to look? "Which course outline sections include elements reflecting Universal Design for Learning, ensuring individuals with disabilities can equally participate in learning?"

-Something generic as required language in Methods of Instruction may be appropriate:

“Accessibility of electronic materials is ensured through elements detailed in Section D of [CVC-OEI Course Design Rubric](#): use of proper headings; use of accessible lists; use of descriptive links; use of accessible tables; use of accessible color contrast (and meaning); uses of images with appropriate alternative text; reading order is correctly set; accessible files (documents, slides, spreadsheets); uses of video/audio with closed captions.”

-DRC staff were clear that the new Title V language reads like part of a general push toward removing the need for adjustments altogether (formerly referred to as “accommodations”). An example of low-hanging fruit here is the current need for notetakers, which could be eliminated by faculty providing good lecture notes or routinely making lecture recordings available. DRC staff are compiling a list of commonly-done things beyond the CVC accessibility requirements faculty might choose from and cite in CORs. Our process can say we’ll look for “at least three” or something like that:

Course content may explicitly cite contributions and perspectives of disabled people relative to subject matter.

Methods of evaluation may stress assessment methods beyond standard exams/essay, giving students multiple ways and chances to demonstrate mastery.

Methods of instruction may incorporate multiple ways of knowing, including storytelling, kinesthetics, problem solving, and relational learning through interpersonal experiences.

Sample assignments may make explicit reference to UDL methods of evaluation.

More specific, concrete elements of UDL here: [CAST Universal Design for Learning Guidelines](#)

Other things to consider:

- Establish a toolkit/resources for faculty to use when updating COR
- Should we have at least one trained reviewer who knows what to look for as it relates to Accessibility & UDL? Perhaps some PD training for this/these reviewers.
- Update curriculum handbook/materials to reflect this title V requirement
- Continuous assessment and evaluation of the process