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

**Tuesday, November21st, 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
* Lisa Danner, Secretary
* Paula Cardwell, Past President

SCC Academic Senate

* Sandra Guzman, President
* Dawna DeMartini, Vice President
* Amy Strimling, Secretary

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. Land Acknowledgement was read by Alisa Shubb
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, Danny Siegfried, Megan Ozeran

## Public Comment Period

## DAS President’s Report

* District Moratorium Advisory task group has begun meeting.
	+ They discussed the challenges around using the surveys.
	+ At an upcoming meeting, one of the moratorium consultants will attend to give more background and clarity around the task.
	+ There were concerns regarding a shared understanding of the law and how it was to be implemented. Also concerns raised about the process. Who will be there to assess and identify the items as being part of or excluded from the process? What will happen to the items deemed excluded from the moratorium process? Will they be returned?
		- There is a difference between what the law requires us to do and what we are ethically obligated to do? For example, at SCC there were remains found of formerly enslaved people. Should those be returned to the department?
	+ Recognizing that students’ educations may be impacted by decisions to remove items until we can obtain replacement items. In considering social justice, we should take into consideration the impact on students, and prioritize the value of education.
	+ Also, let’s consider the need to right our wrongs, even beyond NAGPRA, such as returning remains of formerly enslaved people.
* Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan:
	+ On 11/8 LRCCD Board of Trustees approved DAS’ request that under Plan Component 5: EEO Advisory Committee (page 12) where it states “the committee shall be composed of at least 4 faculty representatives” it will instead read “the committee shall be composed of at least 4 faculty representatives *appointed by the District Academic Senate.”*
	+ DAS President submitted request on 11/13 to Interim Director Diversity, Compliance, Title IX Alex Casarenos that the EEO Advisory Committee be listed on the LRCCD Employee web page under Committees: <https://employees.losrios.edu/our-organization/committees> with meeting agendas, minutes, and other relevant supporting documents posted to that site. We also request that an official membership list be included: <https://employees.losrios.edu/lrccd/employee/doc/committee/committee-membership.pdf>, which Alex approved
* 2 faculty appointments to screening & interview committee requested for **Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)** Job Posting #: AE00905P Close Date: 01/012024
	+ Question: Is DO planning to centralize the research offices?
		- They say this is not their intent
	+ It was noted that a management transfer option was posted by HR for this position, which seemed unusual
	+ DAS President needs interested people to come forward before the next meeting
* FYI, there is an ongoing informal process to gather feedback about the auto-drop process. DAS President inquired whether this process was meant to be a governance process. According to FLC VPSS Kellie Butler:
“Over the last few semesters, district fiscal has requested feedback from the VPSSs on the auto-drop process. This fall fiscal decided to engage the VPSSs/VPIs to take a closer look. This is not a formal governance committee, but administrative in nature. This semester, I was asked to lead an effort of getting feedback from different frontline employees, who have knowledge of and experience with the auto-drop process.” There is a Nov 30th deadline for receiving feedback.
* FYI, there has been a decision made related to grades that appears to have not had counselor input. According to Director of Enrollment Services David Rowe:
	+ “as part of A&R’s ongoing Credit for Prior Learning automation project, a new Transfer Cumulative GPA line was added to student transcripts”
	+ No counselors or articulation officers were consulted about this process

## 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. Remote attendees were approved

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

### 9. District Textbook Affordability Task Force Low Cost Materials Designation *(second reading)*

*Action: Does DAS support change the definition of Low Textbook Cost from $40 to $30?*

Background:

This action is requested by the District Textbook Affordability Task Force

[Presentation slides](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1VB_1wsY1WysqWpw9ZfWb7Kz4vVBstzfOK7j1RabR_gQ/edit#slide=id.p)

Discussion:

* This was discussed at an FLC Academic Senate Meeting. At FLC, folks were OK with listing the definition as $30 pre-tax
* At SCC, folks approved of this as well
* At CRC, folks approved of this as well
* At ARC, we have not yet brought this question to the full Senate. ARC will discuss this item at our next Senate meeting on 11/30.

This will be brought to the DAS agenda in our December meeting.

### 10. Turnitin AI detection tool *(second reading)*

Action: Does the DAS recommend continuing to pay for the Turnitin AI Detection Tool?

Background:

* + Los Rios is currently licensed for Turnitin Similarity. Our subscription term ends 6/30/23 and we are paying approximately$120,000 per year.
	+ We would need to upgrade our license to Turnitin Originality if we would like to keep that feature. The cost to upgrade the license is approximately $11,000
	+ There are some additional features we would get with Originality, in addition to AI detection. T[urnitin Comparison Matrix](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1mCcA3UWoLfg5_RU9BvepgAs9xTI0cxCyp_NP0xWz-Bs/edit#gid=1591685393)

Discussion:

* Another data point to consider is that the false positives for detected AI is between 1%-4%. In other words, 1%-4% of papers entirely written by humans might be identified as having been written by AI. If we multiply this out to thousands of students, this may potentially impact a lot of students.
	+ If we do retain this product we would want to offer training to faculty on how to use this tool responsibly.
* This tool allows us to broach a conversation with students in a more positive way about potential use of AI
* Concern about the potential for misusing this tool. There needs to be training for faculty
* It was noted that the tool itself explains that it is not definitively saying that any given paper is written by AI. It produces a report that emphasizes that it can’t be sure
* At the CRC Senate, some faculty supported retaining the product and others had concerns.
* At FLC, there was not a lot of opposition
* Is there any data from Los Rios students about how they have experienced AI detection? Do we know if students are being falsely accused of using AI?
	+ Note: students cannot see the AI report, only the originality report.
* One professor noted that it is a very effective tool in her grading process, and she has had many productive conversations with students prompted by the AI report.
* It was encouraged that each college create an AI task force to establish/discuss policies and promising practices for how to address responsible student use of AI in coursework
* It was noted that we don’t know how many students have been falsely accused of using AI. There could be faculty who are not using the tool responsibly.
* Is there a deadline for making this decision?
	+ Yes, we need to decide by January. DOIT is hoping a decision will be made today so that they can set up the contract, etc.
* It was noted that it’s difficult to decide, since it hasn’t been brought up at every Senate.
* It was noted that we are deciding whether or not to retain a tool we are already using.
	+ DOIT let us know that if we retained the AI detection tool, our contract would run between 6 months - 12 months.

| Issue: Should we retain the Turnitin AI tool?  |
| --- |
| **ARC** |  | **FLC** |
| Knirk | Abstain |  | Wada | Yes |
| Lopez | Abstain |  | Jensen | Yes |
| McCusker | No |  | Danner | Yes |
| Shubb | Yes |  | Cardwell | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez | No |  | Guzman | Yes |
| Wagner | Not here  |  | DeMartini | Yes |
| Anderson | No |  | Strimling | Yes |
| Crosier | Yes |  | Petite | Not here  |

9 yes

3 no

2 abstain

The motion passes; we will retain the AI detection tool.

### 11. MultiFactor Authentication (MFA) for student use of Canvas (first reading)

Action: Do faculty support students being required to use MultiFactor Authentication to access Canvas?

Discussion:

* At CRC, faculty strongly did NOT want students to have to use MFA to log into Canvas
* Have we gotten much student input? Previously, students were only asked when they wanted the implementation to happen, rather than if they wanted it at all
	+ We should encourage students to feel empowered to ask questions about the decisions they’re asked to provide feedback on.
* This item will come back for a second reading at our next meeting. If we want to make a recommendation, we would need to take a vote on the matter at that meeting

### 12. Recommended changes to CCCApply (first reading)

Background: CCCO memo: [ess-23-41-auto-adt-a11y (2) (1).pdf](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/54352825?wrap=1))

* Degrees listed (ADTs only or all degrees)
* Provide “Transfer without degree” option
* Provide “Undecided/undeclared” option (the idea of keeping this option was more controversial, since it was noted that it has the potential to impact student financial aid.

Discussion:

* Currently there are two options for transfer: transfer with an associate’s degree, or transfer without an associate’s degree
* Then, students have to choose their major. Sometimes, students don’t know what they want to choose yet. Currently, students have an option to choose undecided/undeclared, and a message pops up warning them that choosing this option may impact their financial aid eligibility
* It was noted that these financial aid requirements are imposed restrictions. We could consider removing these restrictions.
	+ For example, students could have 30 unrestricted units where financial aid will apply
		- There was support expressed for making this recommendation
	+ Financial Aid Course Eligibility is a Los Rios-imposed requirement
		- The FACE is not related to the Promise Grant (formerly BOG)
	+ The way onboarding for students happens, they don’t tell them that the Promise Grant isn’t tied to their FAFSA-based aid
	+ The reason DO implemented the FACE audit is because they say otherwise, there will be a lot of fraud where students enroll in classes just for the financial aid.
		- Unfortunately, an impact is that students who want to take classes end up dropping out because they don’t understand why they’re not receiving their financial aid for the classes they’re taking
		- The DAS will convene a resolution-writing group to recommend that students be allowed 30 unrestricted units.
* It was suggested that the DAS members apply via CCCApply to experience the process themselves
* Could Meta Majors show up first in CCCApply?
	+ Maybe, but our meta majors are not aligned across the district
* We do agree we would like all degrees listed, not just ADTs.

## Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

### 13. Textbook Affordability Task Force request to become a DAS standing committee (Sarah Lehmann, ARC librarian)

[Proposal from the Task Force](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dA56OVN8pJakg5zYj3ICj8B2ttUlNT0INXez67yg-VU/edit?usp=sharing)

Discussion:

* Recommendation to clarify committee membership – ie recommendation for 2 faculty, that 1 should focus on OER, etc
* Communication norms for this group – communicate out to faculty on these issues
* We would form a committee where there is an academic and professional matter that needs our attention but DAS is not the appropriate body to do that work, and would decide to “outsource” it to a subcommittee

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

### 14. LRCCD General Education & Graduation requirement revisions

Discussion:

* We are urged to make decisions about this process due to state deadlines
	+ It was noted that it feels uncomfortable to be asked to make rushed decisions
	+ Background: the State BOG approved this change in September, and they were “chaptered” immediately, which starts a 180 day timeline to get our policies & regulations aligned with what Title 5 says. Because the catalog is presented to students in April, this would ideally need to be in place by then. In talking with AOs and Curriculum chairs, no one thinks there is any way we can meet this timeline. We thought we’d have a year or more but actually we would have a few months. Across the state, everyone is in the same boat. We can only do what we can do, but we need to at least be on our way towards meeting this requirement. We may get local push to move quickly on this. We need to be vigilant about showing that we need time for the process to make these decisions.
* We have four options for our local degree graduation requirements:
	+ Take the approved CALGETC and make that our graduation requirement
	+ Use CALGETC plus 3 units of Living Skills
	+ Use CALGETC plus 3 units of Living Skills AND 3 units of American Institutions
	+ Use CALGETC plus 3 units of American Institutions
* We should get very broad input from faculty on these issues. This probably can’t be done just through the Senates. DAS President has talked to Vice Chancellor Gabe Ross about taking a short time during convocation to present these options. Also, a Districtwide charette is an option. Put the information on a website so everyone can see it. Possibly a survey. People need time to think about this.
* It’s tough because we are talking about the philosophical values of Living Skills, of American Institutions, of our obligation to society. What does it mean to give an associate’s degree with/without these elements? But also, each of these requirements comes at the cost of students’ time and money. Every additional requirement is a barrier to some students receiving their degrees.
* It was noted that the second part of this discussion is whether we want to bring our regulations in alignment with the Title 5 allowance that says students can use any GE pattern to meet local degree requirements, not just CALGETC. This gives more options to students but would be a headache to DOIT to program additional degrees into our system.
	+ What are the potential negative impacts to students? (None?) It would mainly be a negative impact to DOIT
	+ Are there any overlooked impacts to students to allow choice of degree pattern?
	+ As a body, we first need to recommend that we want to request changes to that policy. Down the road as the revisions happen, we can continue to weigh in, but it is not just us who weighs in – it is the Board’s ultimate decision.
	+ If we opt for choosing the permissibility of using any GE patterns, many students may choose CALGETC anyway because it has 2 fewer requirements.
		- Actually it’s not that simple – there are a number of other differences between the GE patterns that would impact a students’ decision. For example, for CSU GE there are transfer requirements to take poli sci and US History anyway
		- Is there a risk that students would choose to get their degrees at colleges that have fewer graduation requirements?
	+ It was noted that changes in policies need to go to the board
	+ What is in the best interest of students? Why don’t we ask them? What are ways we can get student input?
		- Student senates
		- Survey?
		- Share information via a website
	+ Could we get a side-by-side comparison of the different GE patterns?
* The DAS needs to pipe up with our recommendations so that General Counsel can begin drafting the recommendations
* Concerns that this may not make it into the Fall 2024 catalog
* Noted that it would be much better to have a year+ to make this decision rather than a few months

This will come back to DAS for more conversation

### 15. PREP Coordinator and instructional faculty leads

DAS President made us aware of this issue at the Nov 7 meeting. The district was made aware of the lack of faculty input, and the issue of faculty leads job description has been brought back to PREP for discussion.

Discussion:

* It was deeply disappointing that this didn’t come through PREP in the first place. Many missed opportunities to collaborate with faculty and get input.
* Looking at the job description and criteria, it seems there would not be very many faculty who meet all the criteria. It makes it difficult to recruit campus leads.

### 16. ASCCC Plenary Debrief

Discussion:

* FYI, upcoming discussions about common course numbering/CID
* Unexpectedly, the Los Rios’ contract equity reflection was presented as a best practice/effective way to integrate equity with PRTs
* DAS President shared in a breakout session that Los Rios had written a resolution advocating for part-timers to receive compensation for College service, and this is now part of our contract

### 17. Revisions to proposed R-3412

 [R-3412 Track-changes document](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CMm7xz8Id7oiUkvlutcVdEQbAf7rWDT8/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111365725088157068297&rtpof=true&sd=true)

Discussion: This will come back for discussion at a later meeting because the General Counsel hasn’t had an opportunity to weigh in

Meeting was adjourned at 5:11pm

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

* Request to add cluster hires to a future DAS meeting
* There has been a Board request for a counseling presentation. It is urged that counselors at each college be given an opportunity to provide input into this presentation.
	+ This presentation is scheduled for Dec 12, and as of now, no counselors have been approached for input into this presentation
* The Board has asked for an AB 1705 presentation as well, and it has been extended because Math faculty really wanted an opportunity for input

## 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*

##

## Other meeting reports

### Budget – *Troy Myers*

### Calendar

### Program Placement Council (PPC) – *Alisa Shubb*

### LRCFT – *Jason Newman*

Land Statements