# District Academic Senate (DAS) Meeting Minutes

**Tuesday, March 7th, 2023 - 3:00 -5:00 pm**

Teleconference meeting locations:

**Los Rios District Office Main Conference Room**

**ARC: ARC Administration Building Conference Room**

**CRC: Learning Resource Center (LRC) -125**

**FLC: FL2-145**

**SCC: Student Center 105**

<https://lrccd.zoom.us/j/84695861936?pwd=alhnSjMwTTAyRndOL1J0aTZNNHNSdz09>

Meeting ID: 846 9586 1936 Passcode: LosRios

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Campus | Role | Present |
| Alisa Shubb | ARC | District Academic Senate President | x |
| David McCusker | ARC | District Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Carina Hoffpauir | ARC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Brian Knirk | ARC | Academic Senate Vice President | x |
| Veronica Lopez | ARC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Alisa Shubb | ARC | Academic Senate Past President | x |
| Scott Crosier | CRC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Lisa-Marie Mederos | CRC | Academic Senate Vice President |  |
| Jacob Velasquez | CRC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Greg Beyrer | CRC | Academic Senate Past-President | x |
| Eric Wada | FLC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Danielle Beck | FLC | Academic Senate Vice President | x |
| Lisa Danner | FLC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Paula Cardwell | FLC | Academic Senate Past President | x |
| Sandra Guzman  | SCC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Dawna DeMartini | SCC | Academic Senate Vice President | x |
| Amy Strimling | SCC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Lori Petite | SCC | Academic Senate Past President |  |
| Bill Simpson | ARC | District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) | x |
| Morgan Murphy | FLC | District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) | x |
| Ea Edwards | CRC | District Equity & Student Services Committee (DESSC) | x |
| Jason Newman | CRC | Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) |  |
| Kandace Knudson | SCC | Instructional Accessibility Committee | x |
| Georgine HodgkinsonKalinda Jones | CRCFLC | Prison Reentry Education Program Committee (PREPC) | x |
| Tamara CheshireKeith Heningburg | FLCSCC | Ethnic Studies Faculty Council |  x |

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome / Call to order

2. Land Acknowledgement: [FLC Land Acknowledgment](#_heading=h.30j0zll) read

3. Approval of Agenda: Approved

4. Approval of Minutes: Approved

5. Introduction of Guests: Brian Pogue, Craig Davis

6. **Public Comment Period** (up to 3 minutes per speaker)

Concern that there seem to be no rules or policies in place around when hiring interviews will take place on Zoom. Desire expressed that faculty have input on those policies.

7. DAS President’s Report

* Push notification request acknowledged
* Directory deadline March 24 (LRCFT and DAS advocated for deadline to be moved from 3/10 to 3/24)
* Student Parking fees: There is a plan to reinstitute student parking fees in the fall. Interest expressed in learning how parking fee revenue is allocated. Interest expressed in learning more about how much revenue is involved, and why it’s necessary given that we had no parking fees for several years. Suggested that this is a 10 plus 1 item falling under student success.
* DAS President reassigned time update: Message sent to district requesting increase in reassign time for all future DAS presidents and not to redistribute current reassign time. No reply yet. Will try again.
* BOT retreat summary: Reflected on how they work as a board. Not all board members indicated that they believed we were moving in the right direction. Trustee Wilkerson asked for a future presentation on family leave. Discussions about the future of student housing (dorms).
* [Spring 2023 policy & regulation updates](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_n544WIZlTQCUHbMWl4U0m-XZ8uJfh7lS-_74z0FrIE/edit?usp=sharing) (*Educational Programs & Student Success)*.
* District Textbook Affordability Committee:
	+ Coordinating how to use the Zero Textbook Cost grant funding from the State Chancellor’s Office. One of the requirements of the grant is that when we create ZTC degree pathways, we clearly show students which courses are ZTC. To do this, CRC is currently using Program Maps to display when a course is ZTC. See [this example from CRC’s Anthropology A.S. Degree MapLinks to an external site.](https://crc.losrios.edu/academics/programs-and-majors/anthropology-as-degree-map) – the Z superscript indicates at least one section is offered ZTC. CRC has worked with Bill Simpson and Ryan Bonomo, the MapMaker developers, to get input.  CRC plans to pilot this approach. A subgroup of our committee is exploring whether we can expand this use of Program Maps/MapMaker to all four colleges.
	+ One of the group's roles is to help make sure Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) information is accurate in the schedule of classes. The way the colleges collect this information is by asking faculty to [self-report their ZTC sections using an “eformLinks to an external site.](https://inside.arc.losrios.edu/collegewide/office-of-the-vice-president-of-instruction/faculty-ztc-eform)” We’ll be working with DOIT to place a pop-up reminder in Canvas about the form, and we will also plan to send email reminders. An additional potential idea is to display an announcement on the Online Grading System (OGS) (where class rosters are located and where we submit final grades).  Below is an example of what that might look like:



Support expressed for adding this to the Online Grading System. Inquiry as to whether this could be accomplished when textbook info is submitted to the bookstore. That avenue was pursued, but unfortunately it’s not feasible at this time.

## Consent Items (Any member of the DAS may request an item be removed for further discussion and separate action.) No consent items at this time.

## Decisions (10-15 minutes per item)

1. DAS recommendation to DETC on when to reset Proctorio *(second reading)*

Request from DETC for a recommendation on when to reset Proctorio. Suggested that with likelihood that Proctorio will not be renewed, perhaps this is not a priority.

Shared that ARC senate has not had a chance to discuss this yet so more time would be appreciated. Few concerns/minimal discussion reported at other college senates.

Inquiry if we have data on how many instructors are using features that would be shut off. That data not available at this time.

Inquiry as to how students will be impacted and how many will be impacted.

Suggested that we should not reset during the semester without more info on how students will be impacted.

Suggested that if we will be resetting, we need a plan on how to communicate this to faculty.

Suggested that not resetting could delay mitigating the injustice that Proctorio could perpetuate.

Concern expressed around academic freedom, that a reset could compromise the academic freedom of faculty. Concern expressed that were DAS to recommend resetting Proctorio it could compromise the academic freedom of instructors who use the features that a reset would eliminate.

Desire to respect transparency and process expressed. Suggested that we need more feedback from faculty.

Suggested that sometimes we don’t have an anti-racist option. Example provided that we know requiring students to purchase textbooks will disproportionately impact those affected by the wealth and income gaps created by things like racism and transphobia, but that sometimes there isn’t a zero-cost textbook option, and our best option may unfortunately be something that can exacerbate inequity.

Concern expressed that there may be an equity issue in offering proctoring on-ground, but not offering proctoring online. If that were the case it would provide different levels of access to education.

## Reports (5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. Non-renewal of Proctorio at end of 2023 Fiscal year – *DETC Co-chair, Morgan Murphy*

LMS coordinators and DETC have decided not to renew Proctorio. This decision was informed by faculty feedback. [Timeline](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1k7_ae9K3K1_6poaCCozcGittrjdVuNJzcpNfA5pagpk/edit?usp=sharing) of decision process.

1. AB-2881: Student Parents – *AVC Educational Programs & Student Success, Sonia Ortiz-Mercado* (4:00pm)

[Link to presentation](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1wHN2KssLnoJ1yhe4cmlGTb_G19g_WPayvBAs8YbAyAw/edit?usp=sharing)

Provides priority registration for student parents. A student parent is someone who has a child or children under 18 and who will receive more than half of that support from that parent. Districts are required to implement by July 1, 2023. Students will indicate on application that they are student parents.

Currently approximately 13,600 students are parents, but the ages of the children are not known, so some of those parents will be parents of adults rather than of children.

Inquiry as to what other mechanisms might be available to identify student parents. Concern that we avoid imposing strict requirements or barriers to access that might keep students from getting support they are entitled to, for example requiring a birth certificate be provided. Desire expressed for a simple, student-friendly process.

Concern expressed that some students may not want to self-report as a parent. Also noted that custody or other legal issues could make it difficult for students to know whether they should identify as a parent or not.

Inquiry as to whether priority 0 (P-0) is required by the law or if that was the district’s decision. This is prescribed by law.

Request for a summary of what priority levels are dictated by the state and which are decided by the district.

AB2881 also required districts to develop and implement webpages with resources for students and children by 2/1/23.

Plan to present regs for first reading at DAS 3/21/23 and 2nd reading 4/4/23. Confident that legislative mandate will be met.

Suggested that this would be a good thing to share with faculty so they can share it with students.

Request for summary of info to be able to share with local senate. Draft regs will be provided.

## Discussions (10-15 minutes per item)

1. Support for AB 1705 implementation

What can we as DAS do to support faculty who are impacted by AB1705 implementation?

Suggested that we might employ district workgroups to have a check-in across the district and connect faculty across the district who are dealing with these challenges.

Concern about request to report data before regulations are finalized.

Concern expressed by faculty that our district’s implementation of AB1705 imposes more requirements/restrictions than are actually required by the state.

Workgroups could explore how this is being implemented at other schools.

Concern expressed about faculty burn out.

Concern that discussions about data collection/metrics are occurring at the district level and do not incorporate faculty feedback.

Concern that for corequisite classes, waitlists are not enabled, which hampers the ability to assess demand. This is a problem that has been on going for four years. District reports that they cannot find the tech solution for this problem.

1. Student-facing information on Academic Conduct across Colleges

What are our students seeing about academic conduct in places other than syllabi? What do we say? What do we want to say?

Desire expressed that we get feedback from students.

1. Collegial Consultation

Where are we with our district in terms of collegial consultation?

Faculty grateful to have a collegial consultation report. Glad it’s in writing and being produced periodically.

Inquiry as to how often report is shared with Board of Trustees. Also inquiry as to what happens next. Currently shared once a semester.

ARC moving forward with a resolution supporting SCC’s white paper. Shared belief that this is a critical moment and encouraged others to consider supporting.

Please continue to share concerns around collegial consultation.

Shared that in ASCCC webinar, part of what was discussed was what can a Board be asked to do. Suggested that we need to look at what our Board is empowered to do.

Suggested that it would be appropriate for us to do some onboarding with BOT, sharing what we do, how we can help, what we expect to be consulted on.

DAS president will encourage Board to ask questions or to ask for input.

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

ARC senate is moving forward with recommending priority registration of .75 for students in learning communities.

Shared that at FLC senate concern were shared about emphasis on outreach and enrollment, rather than enrollment. Also noted that number of faculty teaching students has been decreasing.

Concern expressed that workload imposed by hiring the best training disproportionately impacts faculty of color. Suggested that a discussion of the impact would be useful. Concern about added workload from combining hiring the best and equity rep training.

## Committee Reports (as time permits, written reports will be posted to Canvas supporting material section and included in subsequent meeting minutes)

* District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) – *Bill Simpson* [Report](#bookmark=id.3znysh7)
* District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – *Morgan Murphy*
* Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – *Kalinda Jones,* *Georgine Hodgkinson*

Met with Sacramento County Office of Education. Opportunities in the future to serve more Sacramento area youth are deleoping.

* Ethnic Studies Council – *Tammy Cheshire, Keith Heningburg*

Met with Sonia and the director of dual enrollment from DO. Council is excited about possibility of opportunities involving ethnic studies and dual enrollment. One possibility is training/certificate for K-12 teachers

**Future Returning Items:**

* Learning Communities priority registration
* Revisions to Los Rios Regulation [R-3412](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-3412.pdf) (Participatory Governance/Academic Senate)
* Los Rios Policy [P-2222](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/policies/P-2222.pdf) & Regulation [R-2222](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-2222.pdf) (Attendance)
* Operationalizing Equity-minded Professional Learning (mandatory equity training) [Draft Rubric v2](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OWlmCeg5CyZII9L2x584ica6NPDI2QmPEeiJovOlQzs/edit?usp=sharing)

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

* [LRCCD Board of Trustees](https://losrios.edu/about-los-rios/board-of-trustees) Meeting: Wednesday, March 8th 5:30pm (DO Board Room)
* District Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, March 21st 3-5pm (DO Main Conference Room)
* District Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, April 4th 3-5pm (Teleconference locations)
* [ASCCC](https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events) Spring Plenary – April 20-22 DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Anaheim - Orange County

## Land Acknowledgements

[ARC Indigenous Land Statement](https://arc.losrios.edu/student-resources/native-american-resource-center#:~:text=We%20acknowledge%20the%20land%20which,Maidu%2C%20and%20Miwok%20tribal%20nations.&text=Despite%20centuries%20of%20genocide%20and,both%20Federally%20recognized%20and%20unrecognized.)

“We acknowledge the land which we occupy today as the traditional home of the Maidu and Miwok tribal nations. These sovereign people have been the caretakers of this land since time immemorial. Despite centuries of genocide and occupation, the Maidu and Miwok continue as vibrant and resilient Federally recognized tribes and bands. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the generations that have gone before as well as the present-day Maidu and Miwok people.”

[CRC Land Acknowledgement](https://crc.losrios.edu/about-us/our-values/equity-and-diversity/land-acknowledgment)

“We pause to acknowledge that Cosumnes River College sits on the land of Miwok and Nisenan people. We remember their continued connection to this region and give thanks to them. We offer our respect to their Elders and to all Miwok and Nisenan people of the past and present.”

[FLC Land Acknowledgement](https://flc.losrios.edu/about-us/our-values)

“We respectfully acknowledge the land currently occupied by Folsom Lake College as the traditional home of the sovereign Nisenan, Maidu and Miwok peoples who have a unique and enduring relationship stewarding this land since time immemorial. Despite colonization, occupation and genocide, the Nisenan, Maidu and Miwok people continue and thrive in their resilience and self-determination. We celebrate and recognize our Nisenan, Maidu and Miwok tribal neighbors and honor their sustained existence.”

[SCC Land Acknowledgement](https://scc.losrios.edu/student-resources/native-american-student-success/land-acknowledgement)

“We acknowledge the land currently occupied by Sacramento City College as the traditional home of the Maidu, Miwok and Nisenan people. These sovereign people have been caretakers of the area since time immemorial. Despite centuries of genocide and occupation, the Maidu, Miwok and Nisenan people continue as vibrant and resilient federally recognized and unrecognized tribes, bands, and rancherias. Today, we honor and recognize our Maidu, Miwok and Nisenan tribal neighbors for their contributions as the caretakers of the Sacramento Valley and honor their sustained existence. It is with their blessing and continued guidance that Sacramento City College seeks to provide an accessible, equitable, and supportive institution of learning and experience.”

## Supplemental Materials

**District Curriculum Coordinating Committee Report**
The committee met on Feb. 24, 2023.
∙ All of the curriculum proposals were approved.
∙ The committee reviewed drafts of a DCCC handbook and updated instructions for
processing Math and Writing Competency requests.
∙ The committee discussed its options for meeting in March and decided to use the
Brown Act teleconferencing rules. Publicly available sites will be established at DO and
each campus for voting members to use to attend the meeting via Zoom. Those sites
will be included in the publicly published agenda, along with a link to the Zoom meeting.
The next DCCC meeting will be held Mar. 24, 2023.
Respectfully submitted by Bill Simpson, DCCC Chair.

**DETC - 02/23/23**

Online Proctoring

During the LMS Coordinators meeting, the faculty reaffirmed the decision to not renew the Proctorio contract for the 23/24 academic year. The decision was brought forth to the EdTech committee and was again supported by the faculty.

The tool is inequitable in its design and none of the alternatives explored from the proctoring workgroups meet the criteria. The following is the timeline of online proctoring discussions supporting the decision.

2020

* October
	+ Test Proctoring Feedback Survey  At CRC - 76% of faculty respondents were aware of equity issues with online proctoring
* November
	+ [DETC Report to DAS discussed establishing proctoring workgroup](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ywXRUBd9ySu3rMQU_a8HnwFD248EQv4OK2UwrTGFirI/edit?usp=sharing)

2021

* January
	+ [DETC Report to DAS established Proctoring Workgroup](https://docs.google.com/document/d/141KYxvq4YRjh5x_f1y22_9oEN1CvE4V-y1gLYIzSuxA/edit?usp=sharing)
	+ Sought faculty participation for the workgroup to evaluate proctoring needs in Los Rios
* Test Proctoring Workgroup established to review current & possible alternatives for online proctoring. Made up of faculty from each college and a student representative
* Evaluation of the following online proctoring providers
	+ [Proctorio](https://proctorio.com/) (current provider)
	+ [Proctor U](https://www.proctoru.com/)
	+ [Examsoft](https://examsoft.com/)
	+ [Honorlock](https://honorlock.com/)
	+ [ProctorFree](https://proctorfree.com/)
	+ [MonitorEDU](https://monitoredu.com/)
	+ Honorlock & Proctorio are put forth as recommended possibilities if an online proctoring solution is needed
* Discussion within LMS Coordinators & District EdTech continue on the need for proctoring and the inequities of the tools.
* Through discussions and review, Honorlock was eliminated as they were unable to utilize students’ preferred names.

2022

* January - April
	+ Continued discussion ultimately culminating in the decision by the LMS Coordinators to move forward with no online proctoring service due to no viable option that met the criteria in an equitable manner
* May 2022 - LMS Coordinators forward a message to District to notify faculty of the decision - no message was forwarded.
* September 2022 - [DETC Report to DAS mentions sunsetting Proctorio in June 2023](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pzbZiFjFXIBDxfyAh3YGMIZ7lb9Ay8oST4pClIIiIDw/edit?usp=sharing)
* October - December
	+ DETC Reports to Academic Senate include updates on continued discussions for removal of Proctorio
	+ Conversations shift to include deactivation of some features of Proctorio to bring it to a more equitable state for Spring 2023

2023

* Features of Proctorio were disabled that mitigated several of the inequities such as room scanning.
	+ Equity issues persist as the tool only works with the Chrome browser with an extension installed.
* Proctorio can still be fully utilized by a small subset of faculty
* Discussion brought to Senate about a Proctorio “reset” that would make sure all faculty have access to the same features

Local POCR Data Report

Data was presented showing the variance of success rates in online courses that went through the Local Peer Online Course Review (POCR) process. Success rates for the courses pre and post POCR were quite high. There was discussion around the data selection process, including how courses occurring during the pandemic should be handled. No statistical models were presented. A request was made to see the selection process of the data as well as any statistical models used.

There was a brief discussion on what Local POCR may look like moving forward with no guarantee of funds.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and ChatGPT-like large language models

Brief discussion around identifying issues that tools like ChatGPT may present to faculty. A suggestion was made to work to identify those issues at a college level and bring them forth to EdTech to craft a uniform “best practices” with regards to AI tools so students across the district have the same policies.

**DETC - 02/21/23**

Proctorio

* The Proctorio tool needs to be re-installed to provide the same privileges to all faculty
	+ Faculty that were previously using the tool with the recently disabled features can, in some scenarios, maintain the use of the features that increase inequities for some students.
	+ This means that there is not equitable access to the tool among faculty across the district and students may have differing experiences depending on their instructor
	+ The solution is to re-install the Proctorio tool with our current limited feature set. This will require faculty to re-select the Proctorio options for their quizzes.
	+ EdTech is seeking a recommendation from the Academic Senate on when to perform this re-installation