Preliminaries (10 minutes)

1. Call to Order---the meeting was called to order at 3:06pm by President Robinson.

   Approval of the Agenda—approved.

   Announcements---none.

   Approval of the November 17th minutes---approved.

   Public Comment Period (3 minutes per speaker)---none.
Introduction of Guests---none.

Decision Item (15 minutes per item)

2. DAS President Replacement Resolution---a resolution accepting Robinson’s resignation as DAS President was presented.

Whereas, current District Academic Senate (DAS) President Brian Robinson has accepted an administrative position at Folsom Lake College (FLC) and is therefore unable to complete his two-year term (2015-2017) as District Academic Senate President.

Whereas, the Los Rios Community College District faculty are best represented by a DAS President who has experience as a local Academic Senate President.

Whereas, the majority of FLC Academic Senate Past-Presidents have either retired or accepted administrative positions.

Resolved, Sacramento City College Academic Senate President Ginni May take over as District Academic Senate President for the remainder 2015-17 term vacated by Brian Robinson.

Resolved, FLC exchange its turn in the DAS President rotation with SCC and assume the District Academic Senate Presidency for the 2017-19 term.

Motion: Suspension of rules

M/S/U

Motion: Acceptance of Resolution

M/S/U

3. Proposed Increases to Reassigned Time---May has started a draft for proposal to increase reassigned time---proposal included increase for chair of DCCC from .1 FTE to .2 FTE, .4 to .6 for ARC and SCC curriculum chairs, .4 to .5 for CRC and FLC; increase from .1 to 2 for chair of DMSSS; and stipends for summer work by senate presidents. Some of the summer work for presidents has recently included issues such as dual enrollment, bachelors degrees, and student equity.
It was noted that DAS needs to look back for last time that we got reassigned time bump. In addition, Crump will check the ASCCC Local Senate Profile for information of reassigned time/stipends throughout the state.

**Discussion Items (15 minutes per item)**

4. Equivalency Processes---waiting to hear from LRCCD Legal Counsel J.P. Sherry. LRCCD Deputy Chancellor Lorimer is open to getting a faculty group to meet with Sherry, and Associate Vice Chancellors Cox and Nye to discuss District compliance with state equivalency requirements.

5. Items from College Senates & District for DAS consideration.

   CRC IT---to discuss the ability of faculty to contact students via text messaging directly from the online rosters.

   FLC---program review process for interdisciplinary programs---who should be doing them.

**Reports (5 minutes per report)**

8. Meeting with Deputy Chancellor Lorimer---issues discussed included reassigned time and equivalency processes (see Items 3 and 4 above). There is interest in adding faculty (one from each college) to a group being formed for strategic planning---Dean Murakami (ARC), Julie Oliver (CRC), Carlos Lopez (FLC), TBD (SCC).

9. DCCC Report (Corbin)---see Appendix A.

10. DMSSS (Degn)---no report

11. DETC (Beyrer)---Beyrer will be taking Type C leave for Spring 2016. Scott Crosier will be co-chair of LMS Workgroup. Beyrer also noted that he had received a proposal about the preferred name of a student appearing on the online rosters. He was advised to send this proposal to Lorimer.

12. ASCCC (May)---no report

13. LRCFT (Perrone)---no report.

**Future Agenda Items**

**Future Events**
1. LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting---December 9

**Adjourned**---the meeting was adjourned at 3:59pm

---

**APPENDIX A:**
DCCC Report to the District Academic Senate, December 1, 2015

1. Curriculum: All curriculum from the November 20 DCCC meeting was approved except for ENGWR 290 (SCC) because it is in a thematic block that is reserved; DCCC has asked the course number be changed to one in a thematic block that matches the type of course it is. New items and deletions have been forwarded to put onto the December 9 Board Agenda.

2. Competency Committees:
   • The Writing Competency Committee reviewed ENGWR 341 (CRC) and ENGWR 488 (SCC) and recommended both be approved for writing competency. DCCC accepted this recommendation.
   • DCCC discussed asking the competency committees to regularly review courses that have already been approved for competency and recommends the committees not do this kind of regular review. Instead, DCCC recommends that faculty who have concerns about specific courses bring those concerns to their local curriculum chair to bring it to DCCC, which would then determine whether to call for the appropriate committee to review the Course Outline of Record (COR).

   DCCC members voiced the following points in its discussion:
   o There isn’t anything in Board Regs or Title V that says these courses need to be re-reviewed.
   o The Board Regs are not very helpful in this conversation since they just say that DCCC shall call for a review of competency regularly or as needed; the language is permissive.
   o As a District, we do not review courses that meet general education requirements.
   o An analogy was made to the prerequisite and CSU approval process, specifically that such courses are not regularly reviewed once approved.
   o It may not be appropriate to compare the competency approval process to the prerequisite or CSU approval processes as those processes may not be similar enough.
   o There are several potential impacts to students if courses that meet competency lose that designation.
   o Regular review creates the potential for uncertainty and starts a slippery slope the group doesn’t want to go down.
   o Courses that lose competency upon review could still meet CSU and UC requirements, such as quantitative reasoning, which would be confusing for students to understand and for counselors to explain.
   o In the past, the competency committees have demonstrated an unwillingness to approve courses outside the competency discipline; reviewing those that already meet competency could be a way for the committees to target the courses outside the discipline. For example, there is a concern that Math would just focus on the non-math courses, such as ECON, to knock them off the list.
In the past, courses were sometimes reviewed based on more than the COR (such as syllabi and exams). However, now, the committees can only use the COR, so some CORs may not reflect what makes the course meet competency.

Members of two of the committees have shared situations they encountered for why a regular review would be beneficial:

- A course that met competency was revised, but in the revision the developer removed the aspects of the course that supported it meeting competency.
- The make-up of the committee members who voted in favor of a particular course to meet competency was heavily weighted against subject-matter experts.

Competency Committee Quorum: At the request of DAS, DCCC is putting together a form for competency committees to use for reporting recommendations to DCCC. This form will indicate the members of the committee and how each voted, and will include space for a brief narrative to explain the support or opposition to the course meeting competency.

3. Thematic Blocks:
- Approved new thematic blocks in ENVT and IMAGE (FLC) and in ESLP, ESLR, and ESLW (CRC).
- The committee decided to include as information items on agendas any single college thematic block name changes. For instance, ARC has a number of new Carpentry courses it has recently developed and approved; they have been added into existing thematic blocks, but the names for those blocks were limiting. The new names will be more inclusive.

4. SAG: Phil continues working on the new AO screens. One project on the horizon is an online catalog. In order for that to work, Socrates would need to directly populate the catalog; currently, Socrates populates PeopleSoft and PeopleSoft populates the catalog, which causes problems. As a District, once we are closer to the online catalog, we may want/need to revisit the Board Regs or Policies that require the online catalog match the published (currently: print) catalog.

5. Streamlining Approval Process for CTE Courses and Programs: While the committee has no recommendations at this time, it is looking at which District procedures can be adjusted to better respond to the demands of the business community. In particular, new designator and thematic block requests could be handled differently; for instance, we might allow for local approval of new thematic blocks for disciplines that are at only one college. Another suggestion is to do first and second readings for new designators on the same day. Under current practice, it takes two months to get a new designator or thematic block approved. DCCC will discuss this further at its next meeting in January.