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

**Tuesday, February 20, 2024 - 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
* Lauren Wagner, Vice President
* Eric Anderson, Secretary

FLC Academic Senate

* Eric Wada, President
* Lisa Danner, Secretary
* Wayne Jensen, Vice President
* Paula Cardwell, Past President

SCC Academic Senate

* Amy Strimling, President
* Dawna DeMartini, Vice President
* Lori Petite, Past President
* Nadine Kirkpatrick, interim 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: Kara DeSouza, Christopher Murillo, Teresa Aldredge, Craig Davis, Richard Gentry

## Public Comment Period

No public comments

## DAS President’s Report

* 1. DAS President is participating on the Common ERP Statewide Task Force - the goals of this CCCCO project are to explore the possibility of a common Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution that could support statewide Finance, Student Information Systems (SIS), Human Resources (HR) and Information Technology (IT) staff by increasing security as well as automating and standardizing processes and reporting, while allowing for flexibility at the district and college level.
  2. AA/AS degree faculty survey:
     + 8.7% response rate so far (190 surveys completed)
     + request the following results:
       1. district-level summary that identifies the overall response rate,
       2. the number of respondents from each discipline,
       3. the fraction that are part-time faculty,
       4. the fraction from each college,
       5. the **aggregate responses for each of the two questions,**
       6. the **aggregate response from each college** for each of the two questions
     + Question raised: should there be a deadline announced? DAS agreed Feb 29 will be the deadline; DAS president will convey this to Institutional Research
     + Question: when do we need to approve this change?
       1. Answer: our goal is to make our recommendation by the time we leave for summer break.
     + Question: should each College independently agendize and vote on this item?
       1. This could be done in a few ways: voting, prioritizing the options, bringing forward a sense of the Senate. Each college’s Senate officers need to be prepared to vote on behalf of their campuses. So each campus, please determine, how will your senate feel represented at DAS?
  3. [Changes to Title V regarding priority 1 registration for Rising Scholars](https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/Office-of-General-Counsel/final-rising-scholars-network-regulatory-action-text-2023-0724-a11y-003.pdf?la=en&hash=7839B766B425CA12D4D54FE92110F91BCEB288B9) have been reported to AVCSS Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, who will initiate the process of updating corresponding LRCCD regulations.

## 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. R-7252 - Academic Renewal Draft Regulation (2nd reading)

Background: [*02072024 R-7252 Draft w 02062024 DAS Recommendations (1).docx*](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/58822397?wrap=1)

Discussion:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issue: Shall DAS approve the revisions to the Academic Renewal Draft Regulation? | | | | |
| **ARC** | |  | **FLC** | |
| Knirk | Yes |  | Wada | Yes |
| Lopez | Yes |  | Jensen | Yes |
| McCusker | Absent |  | Danner | Yes |
| Shubb | Yes |  | Cardwell | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** | |  | **SCC** | |
| Velasquez | Yes |  | Strimling | Yes |
| Wagner | Yes |  | DeMartini | Yes |
| Anderson | Yes |  | Kirkpatrick | Yes |
| Crosier | Absent |  | Petite | Yes |

### 10. Request for District accounting of items removed, ordered, and replaced under Moratorium on Use of Human Remains (1st reading)

Draft resolution: [Moratorium Materials Tracking List V2](https://docs.google.com/document/d/16b-z80kuUvAt8STRFCiGk_euEybzepABN1X7RIc0dhM/edit?usp=sharing)

Background: Items have been removed from instruction. DO has approved that needed instructional items will be replaced. DO is in the process of replacing these items, and DAS would like to request a process to track which items have been replaced, which items have been ordered, and when the items arrive and are put into service.

Discussion:

* A request that the information is organized by college
* A request for a status column to keep track of where orders are
* A request for a column to indicate who placed the order
  + There is some language about this in the resolution - see #3, which asks which discipline faculty selected the replacement and placed the order. LRCFT is interested in tracking the faculty workload
* Question: would it be helpful to track the discipline/TOP code for each course the item is used for, so that we know which course it is being ordered for?
  + Suggestion that the request to track the discipline be added to the second RESOLVED
* When the tracking system framework is completed, will this be a document that College faculty leaders will be able to look at, such as a Google doc?
  + Yes. There is a request that this document be shared in real time with LRCFT and DAS leadership.
* Question: what is meant by “proper authority” in the first RESOLVED?
  + There is an interest to differentiate from items that were removed but were beyond the scope of the moratorium
  + This language was revised to add clarity
* Since there is a request to modify the moratorium, should we indicate which version of the moratorium we are referring to?
  + Yes, we will add that information
* This item will return for a second reading at the next meeting

### 11. Collegial Consultation: DAS Vote of No Confidence (1st reading)

Background: FLC Academic Senate has requested that DAS consider drafting a Vote of No Confidence in Chancellor King’s leadership

Document: [Draft DAS VNC V2](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mWdNmRw2eDrPYHvwfjF4asf5EQduEXflmX-CI04u0y0/edit?usp=sharing)

Discussion:

* Approval and support expressed for this VNC draft. This document takes a strong stand.
* Opinion expressed that given all the previous VNCs, the first resolved (expressing no confidence) should remain
* Concern that the second resolved asks the Board to do something they may not be empowered to do, and may be perceived as overstepping
* Opinion expressed that the second resolved does not necessarily ask the Board to remove the Chancellor entirely, just to designate a new designee for collegial consultation on academic and professional matters
* Opinion expressed that we want something in the Resolveds that asks the Board to respond
* Board policy P 41-11 talks about the role of the Chancellor, and how he is responsible for carrying out the responsibilities of the Board. It is prescriptive about the line of succession, and specifies that the Deputy Chancellor would take over.
* Concern that we may not want to ask the Board to designate someone other than the Chancellor to conduct shared governance.
* Opinion expressed that this VNC seems consistent with the trajectory over the years. The Senates have done a lot of measured decision-making in response to the Chancellor’s over the past several years, and have been very patient. Given this, these resolveds make sense and seem logical when considering the actions of the Chancellor over time.
* It seems like there may be two different things that we’re asking for. Hesitation around the fact that faculty are seen as whiners and complainers by the Board. Will this anger or alienate the Board. What is this a vote of no confidence in? Do we need to take a separate vote of no confidence in the Board?
  + Are we there yet?
  + This is an opportunity to see what our Board thinks and does
  + We don’t know what the Board thinks or how they’ll respond, and they likely have a diversity of opinions
  + It does seem like they’ve taken steps to ask the Chancellor to respond to the VNCs and are encouraging additional collegial consultation
* Should we ask the Board to share their reasoning if they don’t take our recommendations?
  + We could ask for a formal written response from the board
    - Support expressed for this idea
    - Is there a way to ensure the entire Board response, not just one rogue Board president?
      * We can request for the Board to respond publicly in open session
  + Should we ask for a formal response either way, or just if they decide not to remove him?
    - Interest expressed that we ask for a formal response either way
  + Can the District Academic Senate request an agenda item for the Board meeting?
    - DAS president has made such requests in the past and been successful
    - What if a joint request for an agenda item were made by DAS and LRCFT to respond publicly in an open session?
      * The Board may deflect this request, given that it is a personnel issue
  + Rather than responding in open session, what if we requested a written response signed by all Board members?
* Idea: the Chancellor’s behavior has negatively impacted student success. Shall we include a Whereas clause that outline this negative impact?
  + Several negative impacts to students were identified and discussed, such as:
    - Not enough faculty hiring
    - At SCC, backfilling faculty counseling positions with classified specialists
    - Davies Hall: putting students at risk
    - Increasing student enrollment without hiring enough faculty and staff to support them. Faculty are spread so thin and are asked to do so much. They are focusing on increasing student enrollment but not increasing faculty. Students can’t get counseling appointments because there are not enough counselors
* Opinion: We may want to think about educating the Board that we are being put in the position of appearing to be naysayers because the Chancellor does not have a full understanding of collegial consultation
* The Chancellor acknowledged faculty three times in the most recent Board report!
* This will come back as an agenda item for our next meeting

### 11. Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

* No reports

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

12. Pathways to degree completion for incarcerated students

Background: [Pathways to Degree Completion for Incarcerated Students.docx](https://lrccd.instructure.com/users/3595/files/58847437?wrap=1&verifier=6sreshXWQcNtOdqtilFKWCY6pAyPlRqyHnT6HPs4)

* At some prisons/yard, there is currently not a pathway to get an AA, because there are certain classes (ie Accounting) that cannot be offered, and there aren’t always enough GE courses such as a lab science
  + The only location to offer all classes to complete an AA through LRCCD is Mule Creek C Yard.
* There is a maximum number of courses that can be offered per semester at each facility because there is limited classroom space
* Interest in making sure we are offering a degree pathway for students, and ensuring we offer a mix of courses that lead to a degree
* The PREP committee is asking for input on how to move forward to address this issue. Currently, the degree situation is precarious for these students
* Incarcerated students get 6 months off their sentence for completion of an AA

Discussion:

* Who is in charge of scheduling classes for the prisons?
  + Unsure; the processes vary considerably across campuses and semesters. Now that it is being managed at district, it’s unclear
* Is there a sense that a department “owns” a degree
  + There was this type of system implemented by the Human Services degree
* Would it make sense to bring this issue to the FLC senate?
* One reason for the DAS PREP committee is to pool resources and information - perhaps PREP could identify those programs that have had some interest in offering a degree, and help bringing the departments across the district together to have a conversation about offering sufficient classes in the prisons so incarcerated students can get a degree.
  + Focus on benefits to the students
* Where does the money go that the District receives for serving incarcerated students?
* Is Program Review needed for PREP?
* Because of a lack of collegial consultation/coordination, some of our students cannot achieve a degree
* With both PREP and Dual Enrollment, students can’t choose their own courses - there are very few courses available. It is better for students to have more choices
* Would we like to invite the District PREP administrator to give a presentation on the status of PREP?
  + PREP will come up with some questions we’d like answered, and DAS president will make the request

### 13. Equivalency committee processes and guidance

Background:

* [CCCCO Minimum Qualifications Handbook](https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/minimum-qualifications/CCCCOReport-Minimum-Qualifications-2023_.pdf?la=en&hash=D3075F5E24FF5D3DB759E61009DC66F0F5060FF6)
* [ASCCC Executive Summary of 2016 paper](https://www.asccc.org/content/equivalency-minimum-qualifications)
* [ASCCC 2020 Position Paper](https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/EquivalencyF20.pdf)
* [LRCCD R-5123](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-5123.pdf)
* [LRCCD Faculty Hiring Manual](https://losrios.edu/lrccd/shared/doc/hr/hiring/faculty-hiring-manual.pdf) (pp 15-16)
* [Equivalency Determination Process](https://losrios.edu/community/jobs-at-los-rios/prospective-faculty-resources/equivalency-determination-process) - outward facing information for prospective LRCCD employees
* [P-38 Form](https://employees.losrios.edu/lrccd/employee/doc/hr/forms/p-38.pdf)

Discussion:

* Concerns brought to DAS president about equivalencies
  + If there are issues with the form, such as not enough faculty signatures, HR should reject it and send it back.
  + inadequate feedback given to candidates
  + Are faculty who are asked to participate in these committees adequately empowered to do this work? There are a lot of different places to go for information
* Do we see deficiencies with the equivalency process? What could we do to provide professional development or training for folks doing this work?
  + Incorporate equivalency info into Hiring the Best training?
  + Suggestion to revise faculty hiring manual. A lack of training may have resulted in the equivalency process being implemented improperly, particularly the “eminence credential” language, which is vague. Should we consider revising the faculty hiring manual to be more clear on how to evaluate a candidate?
  + What are the issues/problems causing us to need to review the equivalency process?
    - The problem originally presented to DAS is that the equivalency committees don’t seem to know what they’re doing.
* Do administrators get any training on how to do equivalencies?
  + Unknown

### 14. Alternative Options to Proctorio

Background: [Comparative Analysis of Proctoring Tools for Los Rios (1).pdf](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/58823293?wrap=1)

Discussion:

* The above-linked document was put together by Ken Cooper at DOIT
* Was there a suggestion to consider Respondus last semester?
  + Yes, Respondus is a similar product and is much cheaper
* There were concerns about Proctorio (or at least the way it was being used) was not equitable and was a violation of student privacy. Are all of these options better for student privacy and equity?
  + All the options meet the necessary criteria for protecting students privacy
* There have been some challenges with Proctorio not working on all browsers; some of these options (such as YuJa) tout the fact that they work with all browsers and Operating Systems
  + Do we have data on the different browsers and OS types our students use?
    - Canvas does track this, and DOIT may be able to pull this data
* Concern expressed that cost should not be a consideration for Academic Senate
* Question: what is the difference between “Priority A” and “Priority B” items?
  + These came from the prior proctoring workgroup, and were created with faculty input
* How soon would the Academic Senates need to let Ed Tech know if there is any input from the Colleges?
  + Ed Tech meets this Thursday
  + Once the choices are narrowed down, it would take about a month to get demos scheduled
  + Our Proctorio contract expires in June
  + The timeline seems rather tight. It would be good to move forward sooner rather than later

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

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

* None

Meeting adjourned at 5:16pm

## Committee Reports

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

* International Education Committee Report: [Study Abroad items discussed at the February 8th, 2024 International Education Committee\_.docx](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/58843055?wrap=1)

## Land Acknowledgements

[Los Rios Community College District Indigenous Land Acknowledgment Statement](https://losrios.edu/about-los-rios/our-values/indigenous-land-acknowledgment) “In the spirit of community and social justice, we acknowledge the land on which our four colleges reside as the traditional homelands of the Nisenan, Maidu, and Miwok tribal nations. These sovereign people have been the caretakers of the health of the rivers, the wildlife, the plant life, and the overall eco-social balance in the greater Sacramento region since time immemorial.  
 Despite centuries of genocide and occupation, the Nisenan, Maidu, and Miwok continue as vibrant and resilient tribes and bands, both Federally recognized and unrecognized. Tribal citizens of these nations continue to be an active and important part of our Los Rios college community. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the land and our responsibility to the original peoples, the present-day Nisenan, Maidu, and Miwok tribal nations.”

[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.”

Voting Template

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