# **District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes**

**Tuesday, October 17th, 2023 - 3:00 -5:00 pm**

**Los Rios District Office Main Conference Room**

[**Remote Participation Link**](https://lrccd.zoom.us/j/85212623490?pwd=Sk5WSDhxaExXanRuWC83RjVWUGJ1dz09)Meeting ID: 852 1262 3490Passcode: losrios

## Members Present

DAS

* Alisa Shubb, President
* Sarah Lehmann, Secretary

ARC Academic Senate

* Brian Knirk, President
* Veronica Lopez, Vice President
* David McCusker, Secretary
* Alisa Shubb, Past President

CRC Academic Senate

* Jacob Velasquez, President
* Eric Anderson, Secretary
* Scott Crosier, Past President

FLC Academic Senate

* Eric Wada, President
* Paula Cardwell, Past President

SCC Academic Senate

* Sandra Guzman, President
* Dawna DeMartini, Vice President
* Amy Strimling, Secretary
* Lori Petite, Past President

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
	1. Welcome new DAS Members:
		1. Sarah Lehmann (ARC), DAS Secretary
		2. Lauren Wagner (CRC) Academic Senate Interim Vice President
2. Land Acknowledgement was read [listed at end of agenda]
3. Approval of Agenda
	1. Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
	1. Minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests
	1. Guests present included: Adam Karp, Megan Ozeran, Craig Davis, Julie Oliver, Teresa Aldredge

## Public Comment Period

No public comments

## DAS President’s Report

1. Welcome to new members
2. Proposed modifications for LRCCD Administrative Regulation [R-3412](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-3412.pdf):

2.1111 (proposed revision, original)

**The administrative co-chair shall communicate regularly with the District Academic Senate and District Equity and Student Success Committee to ensure that the Academic Senate is relied primarily upon on academic and professional matters.**

2.1.1.1.1 (proposed revision with modifications)
**It shall be the joint responsibility of the faculty and administrative co-chairs ~~shall communicate regularly with~~  to ensure that the District Academic Senate and District Equity and Student Success Committee are aware of issues that arise in Educational Technology Committee meetings that fall within the Academic Senate's area of responsibility as a 10+1 matter. The co-chairs shall, at minimum, promptly produce minutes from Educational Technology Committee meetings and highlight academic and professional matters that have been discussed. ~~to ensure that the Academic Senate is relied primarily upon on academic and professional matters.~~**

2.1.1.1.1 (proposed revision with modifications, clean version)
**It shall be the joint responsibility of the faculty and administrative co-chairs to ensure that the District Academic Senate and District Equity and Student Success Committee are aware of issues that arise in Educational Technology Committee meetings that fall within the Academic Senate's area of responsibility as a 10+1 matter. The co-chairs shall, at minimum, promptly produce minutes from Educational Technology Committee meetings and highlight academic and professional matters that have been discussed.**

Explanation from DAS President: When District legal counsel Jake Knapp reviewed the original revision proposed by DAS, District, he thought he noticed a typo, in that DAS’ proposed modification called for the *administrative* co-chairs to help keep the DAS and District Equity Student Success Committee informed of items requiring collegial consultation. DAS President clarified this was not a typo, that DAS’ intent was to ask the administrative co-chairs to take the lead on providing these updates. Knapp and DAS President discussed the matter and considered whether this should be a joint responsibility of the administrative and faculty co-chairs; Knapp and DAS President crafted tentative language reflecting this shared responsibility.

DAS President: are these proposed modifications acceptable to the body?

* Concern raised that it may be too specific for a board regulation to designate how the Ed Tech co-chair will report to DAS
* Concern that there is a pattern of not getting collegial consultation, and hesitant to allocate any other responsibility to faculty in this environment
* Reminder that the District Ed Tech committee is not a committee of DAS, and therefore putting this language in the regulations could elevate the role of the faculty co-chair (which would be a good thing)
* Question: if we don’t agree to this specific language change, what would we do next:
	+ We would craft a different version and keep working on it until we are happy with it and can support it as a body
* What is the issue we’re trying to solve? Is it that we want administration to provide DAS with updates on upcoming technologies?
	+ Two issues:
		- The original revision directed only the administrator to convey info, when it should be a joint responsibility between the administrator and faculty co-chairs
		- “Communicate regularly” is a bit vague
* Concern expressed: there has been disagreement over which issues are 10+1 issues. Can our administrators be trusted to convey the issues that we feel are 10+1 issues? Perhaps all of District Ed Tech’s minutes should be forwarded to DESSC on a regular basis. LRCCD administrators have narrowly defined “academic and professional matters” in a way that suits them and serves them. There has been a breach of trust regarding collegial consultation, and therefore we want the minutes to come to us regularly.
	+ Possible language: “Promptly produce minutes and forward them to DAS?”
* DAS agreed we need more debate on this issue. We will bring this as a discussion item at our next meeting.
1. Question related to the ongoing AB 1705 validation study for math. The math faculty leads who have been working on the AB 1705 validation study are requesting that students who find out they are not succeeding be allowed to petition for an Excused Withdrawal (EW) rather than a W. EW is more favorable on student transcripts. Does DAS support this request?
	1. Concern that the fact that so many students are seeking EWs suggests that whatever placement rules led to these students being in this math class was not successful. Will future students who find themselves in math classes they aren’t succeeding in be allowed to request an EW?
	2. It was noted that typically, EWs don’t count as a “non successful” outcome, but in the case of this validation study, an EW is evidence that the student was not able to succeed based on the placement. Therefore, we should make sure that for this validation study, the EWs should be counted as Ws.
		1. The body agreed with this; Alisa will follow up with the math leads
	3. We want to acknowledge that we greatly appreciate our math faculty in doing this work, in order to make sure we are setting the conditions for students to be successful in math classes
	4. It was noted that this sounds like it is in the best interest of students, but when students withdraw, it can affect their financial aid.
	5. Question: what circumstance leads students to ask for a withdrawal or an EW in a class? How do students find out about the option to withdraw? Could the way they are told about the option impact the study, if they know in advance that there is an EW option?
	6. This will be brought back at the next meeting for a discussion item
2. FLC has appointed faculty to the Math Competency Committee. Thank you FLC!
3. Awhile back, DAS approved the formation of a non credit workgroup. We need some faculty to help draft a charter for this group. Please contact Alisa if you are interested.
4. There was a request that faculty be notified when students add a class after day 1. Alisa has not gotten a response yet.
5. Follow up about employee directory concerns. Adjunct phone numbers are not always correct, and they ring random phones throughout the district. Gabe Ross is aware of this issue and proposes that adjunct phone numbers are changed to the Division main line
	1. Concern that it may be more student friendly to just not list a phone number in the first place; students will call the main line thinking they’re calling their instructor, and all around confusion may result.
6. Potential restructuring of the Career Education Council into a district standing committee with faculty appointments and formal reporting to DAS. There are a lot of academic and professional matters that get discussed in this group. Deputy VC Nye and DAS President are on the same page that it is worth exploring whether this should be a district standing committee
7. LRCCD received a grant to support internships and job training for refugee pathways. The plan for how to implement that grant was developed without adequate faculty consultation
	1. Ideas in the report include phrases like “CTE faculty will…” despite no CTE faculty having been consulted, and examples of activities such as “vocational ESL” training taught by “ESL trainers,” though ESL faculty have not been consulted. Who are the ESL trainers?
	2. A concern was brought up about “contract education.” Corporations are using our credibility as an academic institution to avoid paying their employees to receive essential training. For example, PG&E has proposed a partnership with community colleges to train arborists for utility line clearance. This was not brought through curriculum.
		1. It was noted that faculty have consistently expressed skepticism and concern about this particular PG&E project, and yet it appears in district presentations without there having been any consultation with faculty.
	3. The pathway presentation lists several departments at each college that may participate in the project.
		1. DAS members requested that Alisa ask District admin whether any faculty from these departments were contacted, and if so, who.
	4. Additional concerns were expressed that “not for credit” has been an administrative decision and faculty were not consulted.
		1. It was requested that the DAS president invite a District administrator to attend DAS and address our questions about the RERP presentation
	5. Concern that DAS has been told that not for credit is not 10+1, but saying it doesn’t make it so
	6. It was requested that DAS President alert LRCFT about this. There is a concern about creating a two-tiered faculty structure where some faculty are paid far less than others for the same work.

## Consent Items

(Any member of the DAS may request an item be removed for further discussion and separate action).

1. Approval of remote attendees
	1. This was approved

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. DCCC Articulation Officer Resolution (2nd reading)
	1. Question: Has this been an issue at other colleges?
		1. Yes
	2. Support was expressed for this resolution
	3. Resolution was approved with unanimous support

| Issue: DCCC Articulation Officer Resolution  |
| --- |
| **ARC** |  | **FLC** |
| Knirk | Yes |  | Wada | Yes |
| Lopez | Yes |  | Jensen | Yes |
| McCusker | Yes |  | Danner | Yes |
| Shubb | Yes |  | Cardwell | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez | Yes |  | Guzman | Yes |
| Wagner | Yes |  | DeMartini | Yes |
| Anderson | Yes |  | Strimling | Yes |
| Crosier | Yes |  | Petite | Yes |

1. Moratorium on Use of Human Remains Advisory Task Force [Draft Charter](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YHf3E94jMpc65-T4hDon4a0hU4y_d8QiB5TmY3o5XGs/edit?usp=sharing)
	1. Question: Has District admin seen this proposed charge?
		1. No
	2. Support was expressed for the fact that this is heavily faculty weighted
	3. It was noted that the wording of the charge comes primarily from our faculty content experts.
	4. Motion to suspend the rules to bring this to second reading
		1. Motion was approved
	5. Question: What if we can’t find someone from the Anthropology and Biology departments at each college?
		1. The Senate president could identify someone else who could serve on the task force. This would not stop the work.
	6. The resolution was approved; see voting record below

| Issue: |
| --- |
| **ARC** |  | **FLC** |
| Knirk | Yes |  | Wada | Yes |
| Lopez | Yes |  | Jensen | Yes |
| McCusker | Yes |  | Danner | Yes |
| Shubb | Yes |  | Cardwell | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez | Yes |  | Guzman | Yes |
| Wagner | Yes |  | DeMartini | Yes |
| Anderson | Yes |  | Strimling | Yes |
| Crosier | Abstain |  | Petite | Yes |

## Reports

1. District Textbook Affordability Task Force: Low Textbook Cost (LTC) Materials Definition Recommendation *(Megan Ozeran, FLC Public Services Librarian)*
	1. Megan Ozeran presented a recommendation from the District Textbook Affordability Task Force to lower the definition of “low textbook cost” from $40 to $30.
		1. Question: Why isn’t sales tax included?
		2. Question: Do CSUS or UC Davis have a Low Textbook Cost Definition?
			1. CSUS: $40
			2. UC Davis does not have a definition, likely because they use a process known as automatic textbook billing, whereby students pay an overall fee for digital access to all their textbooks
		3. Question: Why was $30 chosen and not $20?
			1. We based the recommendation on statewide recommendations and student survey data (a majority felt $30 or less was low cost).
		4. This will go to the colleges to discuss at each Senate, then will come back to DAS for a first reading

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Collegial Consultation [Draft 2023 Report](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UkSbcaIA6KSx6Q9Dfy5LhDYX-toXw1T4FM-CrVWYT7U/edit?usp=sharing)
	1. DAS President reminded the Senate about the collegial consultation report and rubric. This rubric criteria was read to the Chancellor today, and DAS President will share the report with District administration.
	2. It was noted that the very fact that in 2019, the DAS felt it was necessary to ask the DAS President to monitor the state of collegial consultation in our district indicates the grave concerns
	3. At the IBA Collegial Consultation training, Chancellor King agreed that rather than unilaterally decide what is collegial consultation, he will run it past DAS first. He has not ever done this.
	4. This is a willful pattern of ignoring faculty interest and saying, in effect, “this issue doesn’t require collegial consultation because I said so.”
	5. It was noted that as regards the ARC and FLC resolutions, Board President John Knight responded individually to the DAS President rather than respond on behalf of the Board. In this way, he did not act appropriately in his role as Board president.
	6. Do we think this rubric will have an impact on District leadership’s decision making? If not, should we escalate our advocacy?
		1. It was suggested that it seems like our Deputy Chancellor is persuaded and motivated by this rubric, and wants to work to improve collegial consultation. It was suggested that our Chancellor doesn’t acknowledge the request for collegial consultation
		2. This record is a helpful way to keep track of what happened in each situation
		3. We have tried similar approaches and have not noticed a improvement in collegial consultation
	7. This document provides helpful context for the local Senates
	8. At ARC, faculty are considering a vote of no confidence and a workgroup has formed to write a resolution
	9. Senate presidents should be directed by their bodies on how to respond
	10. Question: is this rubric/scorecard of the District Admin’s record on collegial consultation a public document?
		1. Once it is finalized, it will be published as a public document
	11. What are we asking to be done? What kind of leadership do we want? We have been asking for more consultation. It was suggested that currently, the Chancellor does not seem to direct or encourage district administration to seek collegial consultation. It was suggested that the Chancellor seems very removed from the decision-making processes at the district. A good leader would help us facilitate collegial consultation.
	12. It was suggested that possibly, our current Chancellor is either unable or unwilling to facilitate us getting the level of collegial consultation that we are legally entitled to (and that creates a positive culture at the college).
	13. It was suggested that our current Chancellor may be unwilling to give up power.
	14. It was noted that collegial consultation is about building community and facilitating collaboration.
	15. It was suggested that the district leadership are abusing their power.
2. [Turnitin AI Detection Tool](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/53869079?wrap=1)
	1. Ed Tech co-chair Morgan Murphy posted information about this tool on the Ed Tech discussion board in the DAS discussion boards.
	2. This will come back as a separate item.
	3. District Ed Tech does not recommend adopting this tool, based on the lack of accuracy and the fact that there will soon be a cost.
	4. Question: is the only issue the cost? A: no, and we could choose to recommend adopting it, and they would likely adopt it.
	5. Have faculty been given enough of an opportunity to evaluate it?
	6. It was noted that there can be negative ramifications that come from using an imperfect AI tool.
		1. Could faculty get additional training in order to use the tool effectively?
	7. Concern was expressed that this information was in Canvas. Canvas limits the way the information can be shared and makes it challenging for the secretary to make this information accessible in the minutes.
		1. Alisa will pull out the information into a Google doc
	8. Recommendation that we refrain from considering the cost as the primary reason to say yes or no. We can present the pros and cons and limitations to faculty. The cost should not factor in.
3. MultiFactor Authentication (MFA) for students
	1. Postponed
4. Faculty hiring guidelines
	1. Postponed

Meeting adjourned at 5:19pm

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

None.

## 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*
* District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – *Ea Edwards*
* District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – *Morgan Murphy*
* Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – *Kalinda Jones*
* Ethnic Studies Council – *Tami Cheshire, Keith Heningburg*
* Instructional Accessibility Committee  *- Kandace Knudson*
	+ The IAC met Monday, Oct. 16, 2023. The committee discussed the LRCCD counsel’s follow-up to the California State Auditor’s [2017 accessibility-related audit](https://www.bsa.ca.gov/reports/2017-102/summary.html) of LRCCD and two other districts; information is being gathered to report back to the State Auditor on our progress since the 2017 audit. The IAC is asking for more information from counsel about the extent of needed current and future follow-up, as the committee members were not aware of any ongoing need to report back to the State Auditor. Universal Design Accessibility Support coordinators are making great progress in their work with faculty colleagues to increase the accessibility of our students’ learning environment. Look for workshops and other opportunities to work with these coordinators at your campus. Committee work will focus on explaining the necessity and importance of this work, finding and sharing easy ways of making instructional materials accessible, and helping faculty understand that students need accessible materials to adequately learn and succeed. Our next meeting will be Monday, Nov. 20, 2023 3-4:40. The IAC is seeking additional classroom faculty to join our committee; please contact Kandace Knudson for more information.

## Other meeting reports

* Budget – *Troy Myers*
* Calendar
* Program Placement Council (PPC) – *Alisa Shubb*
* LRCFT – *Jason Newman*