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

**Tuesday, September 17, 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

* Paula Cardwell, President

ARC Academic Senate

* Brian Knirk, President
* Veronica Lopez, Vice President
* Jeff Sacha, Secretary
* Alisa Shubb, Past President

CRC Academic Senate

* Jacob Velasquez, President
* Lauren Wagner, Vice President
* Eric Anderson, Secretary
* Scott Crosier, Past President

FLC Academic Senate

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

SCC Academic Senate

* Amy Strimling, President
* Ilana Johnson, Vice President
* Nadine Kirkpatrick, Secretary
* Lori Petite, Past President

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order at 3:03
2. ARC Land Acknowledgement was read by Brian Knirk
3. Approval of Agenda
	* Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
	* May 7, 2024 were approved by consensus
	* Sept 3, 2024 were approved by consensus
5. Introduction of guests
	* Guests included LaQuisha Beckum, Kandace Knudson, James Crandall: NAGPRA Liaison

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

* No public comments

## 7. DAS President’s Report

* DESCC Chair
* Fall 24 Plenary to be held November 7-9 in Visalia
* Common Course Numbering taxonomy has been announced

## Consent Items

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

* Approval of remote attendees
	+ Remote attendees were approved

## Committee Reports

(Written reports will be posted to Canvas supporting material section and included in subsequent meeting minutes)

1. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) – Renee Medina
	1. The DCCC is working on integrating common course numbering
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
	1. The District is working to update Admissions and Records processes
		1. The campuses agreed on which AP scores would count for course credit
	2. The financial aid center received 18,000 calls since March. Despite the problems with FAFSA, our students have been able to submit their forms
	3. Dual enrollment students have an average GPA of 3.5, whereas for ARC as a whole the average GPA is 2.9
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
	1. No report
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
	1. Admin not scheduling their IBA proposed a year ago is leading to problems because we are not sure how to intersect with them on the committee and we need to get work done.
5. Ethnic Studies Council – Tami Cheshire - on hiatus
6. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
	1. The Instructional Accessibility Committee is reviewing information on the Accessibility Capability Maturity Model (ACMM), a systematic approach to ensuring compliance with accessibility standards and laws. The CCC Accessibility Center works with community colleges through this process. A recent ruling from DOJ on Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires state and local governments to make sure that their services, programs, and activities are accessible to people with disabilities. This includes online resources and services, including community college websites, courses, social media, etc. California community colleges must be in compliance by April 24, 2026.
	2. The co-chairs will meet with the folks at the Accessibility Center to gather more details. The committee is preparing to vote at the next meeting on whether to put forth a recommendation to formally partner with the CCC Accessibility Center, along with all stakeholders and unions, to achieve accessibility compliance.
	3. *(Additional Information)*
		1. What is [Title II of the ADA](https://www.ada.gov/topics/title-ii)? It requires state and local governments to make sure that their services, programs, and activities are accessible to people with disabilities. Title II applies to all services, programs, or activities of state and local governments. This includes the services, programs, and activities that state and local governments offer *online and through mobile apps*.
		2. [DOJ Compliance Guide](https://www.ada.gov/resources/small-entity-compliance-guide/)
* Includes public schools, community colleges, and public universities
* Applies to online resources and services, such as websites, social media, online courses
* Also applies to contracts, licenses, or other arrangements with other entities to provide public services for your government
* Web content and mobile apps must meet the requirements in the rule. Afterward, must continue to meet the accessibility requirements. Some limited exceptions.

**Compliance date for CCCs: April 24, 2026**

1. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
[Written report](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZeJS03iAF9Y3cKzNY8QA2nbrzrEPM8RvPVP2eLu2HDo/edit?usp=sharing)
	1. **ZTC Data Element**: There have been changes to the data colleges are required to submit about their zero textbook cost sections (the [XB12 data element](https://webdata.cccco.edu/ded/2024/xb12.pdf) in MIS). Right now, faculty self-report this information using the ZTC Designation Form in eServices. DALMC will work on updating this form with the new requirements. A downside of adding more options to the ZTC eForm is that students will also see more options when trying to search for courses with free textbooks. We are working with IT to make it as simple as possible for students.
	2. **Cost Transparency in Instructional Materials**: There are new requirements for colleges to show transparency in all learning material costs ([AB607](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB607)). This law impacts things like calculators, art kits, clay, etc. DALMC will provide additional guidance to faculty to support compliance.
	3. **There are proposed changes to Title 5 regarding textbook affordability**: [Burden Free Access of Instructional Materials](https://drive.google.com/file/d/14yezlPDHRdD_nuXZ-egMRPR31Him9oZZ/view?usp=sharing). A public hearing will take place on Sept. 23, 2024, [Public comment period](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ikGqjh_VrABX1Atj8U-Xlrjwu44ftUw8/view?usp=sharing) ends on Oct. 24, 2024. Written comments can be made through email or letter.

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

### AB 1705 Math Validation Study Excused Withdrawal (EW) Request (Second reading; postponed from Sept. 3)

The District Academic Senate regards a student’s participation in the AB 1705 Calculus Validation Study as constituting an extenuating circumstance for the purposes of an excused withdrawal.

Discussion:

* Suggestion to amend the motion to say: The District Academic Senate recommends that a student’s participation in the AB 1705 Calculus Validation Study constitutes an extenuating circumstance for the purposes of an excused withdrawal.

Vote

| Issue: AB 1705 Math Validation Study |
| --- |
| **ARC** |  | **FLC** |
| Knirk | Y |  | Wada | n |
| Lopez | y |  | Jensen | n |
| Sacha | y |  | Danner | n |
| Shubb | y |  | Cardwell | n |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez | abstain |  | Strimling  | y |
| Wagner | abstain |  | Johnson | y |
| Anderson | abstain |  | Kirkpatrick | y |
| Crosier | abstain |  | Petite  | y |

### Clarification of Understanding Re: Moratorium on the Use of Human Remains, Native American Cultural Items, Images, and Reproductions of Native American Human Remains and Cultural Items (second reading)

No. 3: The use or creation of images and reproductions of Native American human remains and cultural items (as those terms are defined in 25 U.S.C. 3001 et. seq.) under the control of the Los Rios Community College District.

The District Academic Senate clarifies our understanding of No. 3 to mean:

● Images and reproductions of Native American human remains and cultural items under the control of Los Rios may not be used or created. **OR**

● Los Rios may not use or create any images or reproductions of Native American human remains or cultural items.

Discussion:

* Suggestion that it’s important to keep in mind what our faculty thought they were voting on when we approved the moratorium last semester
* Suggestion that it may be more important to clarify the interpretation we’re moving forward with
* Question: if we clarify what we thought we were voting on, how does that change what we do moving forward?
	+ If we thought we were voting for a more narrow scope, then if any items were taken from classrooms but were outside of that scope, those items should be returned
	+ By clarifying what we understood the moratorium to say then, we can clarify how we will move forward
* It was noted that when the moratorium was discussed last year at DAS, Jamey Nye indicated that the scope was narrow. But after it was implemented, the scope became broader
* Opinion stated that based on DAS minutes and ARC Senate meeting minutes, ARC thought they were voting for the more narrow interpretation
* Background: District admin and faculty now have very different understandings of what the moratorium said, and Jamey suggested it may be helpful to clarify what we thought the moratorium meant. It is important to clarify what we thought we were voting for
* Sac City’s notes from the meetings we had when discussing NAGPRA indicate that clearly, faculty were voting for the more narrow definition. Faculty felt the moratorium couldn’t possibly cover all images on the Los Rios campuses, because that would involve removing books from the library, which faculty would not have approved of.
* Sac City has plastic replicas of cultural items that the district currently won’t return. It is hoped that if faculty clarify that we thought we had approved the more narrow scope, those items will be returned.
* Statement that Jamey Nye and Jake Knapp initially had the same understanding that faculty had (a narrow scope of the moratorium), but later decided on the more broad interpretation.
	+ Opinion: it’s possible that in conversations with the tribes, they shifted their position. It’s understandable to want to accommodate the wishes of the tribes as much as possible. We also want to balance academic freedom and the needs of instructors.
* There is a group working on creating a NAGPRA policy, and once the policy is approved, the moratorium will sunset
	+ Based on the current timeline, it will likely not be until Fall 2025 that the NAGPRA policy is finalized and any items that do not fall under the new NAGPRA policy would be returned
* Note: we are not suggesting revising the moratorium. We want to clarify our understanding of which images, replicas, reproductions faculty could and could not continue to use
* Question: if we all understood the moratorium to be the narrow scope, why do we need to clarify this?
	+ Opinion that district took the broad approach when taking away items from the departments, even though faculty thought they had approved the narrow approach. The words didn’t align with the actions.
* NAGPRA does not cover plastic remains.
	+ Opinion: some members of the tribes that met with Jamey expressed interest in having those plastic replicas removed and repatriated to them. So, Jamey changed his interpretation to align with this interest of the tribes.
* Could we just show Jamey our DAS minutes that clearly indicate that we understood the scope to be narrow?
	+ The fact that Jamey came back with a proposed revision to the moratorium last semester, which DAS questioned, indicates that we didn’t approve the broad interpretation
* We need to keep in mind that we wanted to respect the interests of the tribes, which are sovereign nations, and that there is an equity component to this discussion and decision
* If we had interpreted the moratorium language to be the broad scope, that would bring up questions about things like “I traveled to a cultural site and took a picture, can I show that picture in my slideshow?” or “I bought a basket in New Mexico, can I display it in my office?” Faculty discussed these scenarios and determined that the scope proposed in the moratorium was narrow. The narrow scope only covers items in control of Los Rios. This would limit, for example, someone in possession of a Native American cultural artifact from going to the local makerspace with that artifact and making a replica before turning it over. It would NOT limit a faculty member from showing a slide of a cultural artifact.

Vote:

| Issue: The DAS President will inform Jamey Nye that our interpretation, when we voted on the moratorium, was the narrow scope, meaning “Images and reproductions of Native American human remains and cultural items that are under the control of Los Rios may not be used or created” |
| --- |
| **ARC** |  | **FLC** |
| Knirk | abstain |  | Wada | n |
| Lopez | y |  | Jensen | y |
| Sacha | abstain |  | Danner | y |
| Shubb | y |  | Cardwell | n |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez | y |  | Strimling  | y |
| Wagner | y |  | Johnson | y |
| Anderson | y |  | Kirkpatrick | y |
| Crosier | y |  | Petite  | y |

### Proposed addition to Board Policy P-7412 2.3.3.7.2 (first reading)

Students in majors with 45 units or more of required coursework may petition to be exempted from the Living Skills requirement

Discussion:

* What is the timeline for these changes?
	+ Everything will be in place starting Fall 2025
	+ We are pressed for time and need to keep this process moving
	+ When we bring this back to DAS to vote, can we vote on all the changes together?
		- Yes, it will be a package vote at second reading on Oct 1 - please get feedback from your local senates

### DAS participation in the Los Rios Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Process relating to IBA (first reading)

Discussion:

* Chancellor King said he had served on an IEPI team, and the IEPI folks asked him if he wanted to apply for a grant - in other words, it wasn’t his idea to apply according to him.
* He said we did this because the opportunity was there and we used to have IBA, and we might want to reimplement it, even though it is slightly antiquated. If Senate doesn’t want to be involved, we could give the money back. Though, we don’t have the money yet.
* The Senate president needs to sign off on whatever plan is ultimately developed during the IEPI process
* It’s on the Chancellor’s Cabinet agenda, and an IEPI team visit has been scheduled
* There is a disconnect regarding DAS’ level of interest in participating in this IEPI grant. During the DAS president’s report in July, a statement was made that “we are receptive to re-invigorating the IBA process.” However, DAS had not discussed whether we were interested in participating in this.
* Could it be that the Board has urged Chancellor King to do something to address his four votes of no confidence, and this is the approach he has chosen
* Not opposed to IBA per se, but we have had failed IBA processes in the past
* If we decide to bring back IBA, highly recommend this body suggest a few areas where IBA will be implemented first.
* Collegial consultation on academic and professional matters is not something that requires mediation - there isn’t really room or a need for IBA in faculty making recommendations on 10+1 issues.
* IBA is not a robust means of communication. The district gets to choose when they don’t use IBA
* The application makes it sound like our problems only started during the pandemic. This is gaslighting. There are numerous white papers and documents indicating the chancellor’s longstanding failure to respond in a meaningful way to the legitimate concerns of the Academic Senate. It is clear Chancellor King is still not listening.
* Opinion: this IEPI process is happening. I don’t think we should be voting on whether we will be participating or not. Refusing to send faculty to the listening session will not accomplish anything. It makes sense to show up to this IEPI visit and say the kinds of things we’re saying now. IBA is not the issue, the issue is collegial consultation and we want to be part of solving that problem
* Are they trying to bring back the trainings that were held at the hotel with faculty, staff and managers all together?
	+ With an IEPI, you bring a problem to this group of outside folks, host listening sessions, and they come up with a variety of options to help you solve the problem. After the IEPI team hears all the concerns expressed, they may come back with different ideas or trainings. They don’t tell you what to do but they give you suggestions. From their suggestions, the colleges/district would make a plan on what direction to go to solve the problem. If faculty don’t go to the listening sessions, the IEPI team will not hear the real story.
* Not all that interested in IBA…it isn’t an especially powerful tool and doesn’t close the loop when there is disagreement. But interested in finding some way to work through our issues with collegial consultation. Whatever comes out of this process, it’s something that could help the whole district. We have unique issues with collegial consultation. Fortunately for us, collegial consultation is the law. Faculty have primacy in academic and professional matters. Other groups don’t. There should be processes in place for other constituency groups. Brian King is on his way out – let’s not make decisions based on him.
* Would like to help the District find a more meaningful strategy for resolving issues.
* Other groups may not be able to speak freely about their concerns at Chancellor’s Cabinet because their jobs are threatened. Faculty should attend to voice their concerns and share the real story, because faculty jobs aren’t at stake.
* Opinion expressed that IBA is an effective bonding experience for colleagues.
* Opinion expressed that IBA should not be brought back, but we should have a discussion about it and be involved in the IEPI process.
* Opinion expressed that we should not vote on this

## Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

* No reports

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

### Noncredit Feasibility Task Force

* About a year ago we agreed to accept the task force recommendations as long as there was a feasibility study.
* [Noncredit Feasibility Task Force Draft Charter](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/65796477?wrap=1)
	+ Three teams to study the issues DAS was concerned with, such as equity,
	+ We would ask that the task force report back to us in April with their opinion on whether noncredit was feasible or not
	+ Might be good to clarify how many faculty we want in each group
* SCC Admin wants to offer noncredit classes, but SCC Academic Senate President advised them that they could not do that yet since we haven’t done the feasibility study.
* FYI, LRCFT is not opposed to noncredit
* At the end of the day, noncredit is curriculum. Faculty need to write curriculum, this is a 10+1 issue. Which curriculum/courses gets created is also a faculty matter.
* This will come back as a decision item.
* Why would we want to offer classes as noncredit vs credit?
	+ We could offer classes like math skills courses, specialized courses taught by instructors who work in industry but who may not have degrees, etc.
	+ Co-enrollment is also possible, where some students can be taking the course for credit and others can be doing it noncredit.
1. DAS Subcommittee Charters

Should all DAS Subcommittees adopt and publish charters that include (but are not limited to) such areas as Purpose, Area of Responsibility, Committee Composition, Meetings, Voting, etc?

* It’s helpful to have things written down for leadership transitions
* Don’t want to micromanage or give extra tasks, but yes, it might be helpful to have charters
* It is also helpful to have accountability for the decisions made by the committee
* General agreement that yes, charters would be helpful

### AI Summit

* FLC may co-host the AI summit
* Who should be surveyed regarding involvement the AI summit?
	+ The survey will broadly ask, “what are you hoping to discuss at the event? What do you want to get out of it?”
	+ Suggestion to send the survey to all faculty

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

* Possible item from CRC: assumption of risk waivers that students are asked to sign
* SCC would like to discuss cluster hiring and hiring in general. There were inaccuracies in a recent hiring report
* FLC has been discussing AI and is very interested in the summit

Meeting adjourned at 5:03pm

## Future Returning Items:

* Faculty hiring
* Manual revision process
* Long Term Temporary positions (LTTs)
* Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP)
* Equivalency processes
* Strategic enrollment management plan
* District Budget/LAO Report

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

* Sept. 23: Chancellor’s Cabinet
* Sept. 26: EdTech Meeting 4:00 pm
* Sept. 27: DCCC Meeting 2:30 pm
* Oct. 1: DAS Meeting 3-5 pm

## 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 |  |
| Sacha |  |  | Danner |  |
| Shubb |  |  | Cardwell |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** |  | **SCC** |
| Velasquez |  |  | Strimling  |  |
| Wagner |  |  | Johnson |  |
| Anderson |  |  | Kirkpatrick |  |
| Crosier |  |  | Petite  |  |