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

**Tuesday October 1, 2024 - 3:00-5:00 pm**

Teleconference locations:

**Los Rios District Office Main Conference Room**

**ARC: ARC Administration Building Conference Room**

**CRC: College Center Conference Room 3, CC-259**

**FLC: FL2-145**

**SCC: PAC 135F**

[**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

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
2. The CRC Land Acknowledgement was read by Eric Anderson
3. Approval of Agenda
   * Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes from Sept 17, 2024
   * Minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests
   * Jason Ralph
   * Amy Leung

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

No public comments

## 7. DAS President’s Report

* Area A meeting will be on Oct 18. The meeting will be virtual. If desired, the group could Zoom in together from District Office.
* Plenary will be Nov 7-9 in Visalia. Los Rios will field an in-person delegation, and folks can attend remotely as well
* Chancellor’s Cabinet was held last Monday. The IEPI process will move forward; that meeting will also be held on Oct 18. Paula will work to coordinate attendance at both the IEPE meeting and the Area A meeting
* The Moratorium Task Force will meet next week, and will have a writing retreat on Oct 25. They are making considerable headway on the NAGPRA policy for Los Rios.

## Consent Items

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

1. Language to include with our Proposal to Support the AB1705 Math Validation Study EW Request:

○ The DAS requests that

■ We receive a report on the success of students pre-excused withdrawals who participated in the pilot study,

■ Before students are allowed excused withdrawals, we retain the current data that includes students' grades (including D/F/W grades). The current (pre-excused withdrawal) data more accurately depict the throughput or success rates of students who began the pilot study, and

■ These archived, pre-excused withdrawal data are to be used for any reports on the success or throughput rates of students placed directly into calculus. There is a concern that EW petitions will skew the data and present an inaccurate picture of the student experience.

This item was approved by consent.

1. Proposed changes to align with current Title 5 *(this item was moved to discussion)*

Background: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1oKneSuR1_FmWNRU5dozIjqiH2fmKZ44HpeUgQSnIDSE/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs>

○ 2.3.6 Students who show proof of a baccalaureate or higher degree completed at a college or university accredited through a CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation) recognized Regional Accrediting Agency will have satisfied general education requirements for the Associate in Arts or the

Associate in Science degree.. All Associate degrees from institutions accredited from CHEA Regional Accrediting Agencies will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Students who have been awarded a bachelor's degree from an institutionally accredited institution shall be deemed to have fulfilled the

general education course requirements for the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree. Degrees from accredited institutions outside of the United States will be evaluated on a case-by-case

basis. Degrees or courses from non- accredited institutions will not be considered.

○ 2.3.7 Students who have completed the requirements for the Cal-GETC, IGETC, or CSU GE Breadth lower-division general education patterns will have satisfied the general education requirements for the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree.

Note: this item was moved to Discussion

## Information items

1. Jason Ralphs - Regulations updates related to Admissions & Records
   1. Here is a summary of the proposed updates to the regulations. Jason will follow up with the precise language that will be proposed: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ksjIqhx5Sk6RAJwQGgwV7dwzRLOt3Fgm/view>
2. AI Survey
   1. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/AI_Summit_Survey>

## 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. They are working on Common Course Numbering. They have a formal implementation group that will begin meeting this week. They are working with faculty to begin discussions on curriculum for the first six courses that are being converted.
   2. Phil Smith (Socrates programmer) will set things in SOCRATES so that the required curriculum cannot be modified by developers
   3. Phase 2 (the next 20 courses) will be available starting in January
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
   1. We are still looking for a chair for this group
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
   1. Los Rios was notified that we are way over capacity for our Zoom recordings
   2. Safe Los Rios is now available to download on your phone. The ERNI (panic button” will now be on this app rather than on your desktop computer
      1. What will be the practice around logging into this tool? With RAVE guardian, you only have to log in once. With this one, you have to log in whenever you open it - this would not be ideal in an emergency.
   3. Question: what discussions have there been about the KhanmigoAI tool?
      1. Answer: we don't know specifics, but it will be a tool that will be freely available to faculty. DETC has heard that it will be available at the state level to be integrated into Canvas in late October, but then Los Rios will go through an internal process to integrate into our Canvas. It will not just pop up into people’s Canvas, there will be a process. It would be available to faculty only.
      2. Request that there be some training when this tool is rolled out
      3. Request that there be discussions at DAS before this tool is rolled out
   4. Fast Track: This program is coming back, with openings for 40 faculty in the upcoming cohort. It offers one-on-one support faculty can get to make their courses aligned to the CVC-OEI rubric.
   5. Canvas Outcomes: FYI, there is a way to set outcomes for your Canvas courses. It can be done at a higher level - ie for a whole college/whole department. This request was brought to Ed Tech, and they will explore the feasibility/desirability of enabling this feature.
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
   1. The requirement for all student workers to get LiveScans has resulted in Rising Scholars losing their on campus jobs. This requirement may affect other students too
   2. PREP is working with admin to figure out how to make the committee more functional.
5. Ethnic Studies Council – Tami Cheshire - on hiatus
6. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
   1. No report
7. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
   1. No report

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

Working document for items 1-5: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1oKneSuR1_FmWNRU5dozIjqiH2fmKZ44HpeUgQSnIDSE/edit>

1. Proposed Change to Board Policy P-7241 2.1.1 (proposed): Satisfactory completion of a minimum of sixty (60) units of degree‐applicable lower‐division credit courses with a “C” (2.0) grade point average, provided that twelve (12) units must be earned in residence at the district (second reading).
2. Proposed Change to Board Policy P-7241 2.3.3.1 (proposed): English Composition, Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking (six [6] units: three [3] units each from (a) and (b)) Courses in English composition, oral communication, and critical thinking are those which use and examine principles and guidelines of clear and logical thinking and communication.
3. (a) English Composition. Courses fulfilling this requirement must be baccalaureate‐level and include expository and argumentative writing.
4. (b) Oral Communication and Critical Thinking. Courses fulfilling this requirement must be baccalaureate‐level and include oral communication and critical thinking courses. Critical thinking courses develop an awareness of the relationship of language to logic, resulting in the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend. (second reading).

3. Proposed Change to Board Policy P-7412 2.3.3.2 (proposed): Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning (three [3] units minimum) Courses in mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning develop students’ abilities to draw conclusions from numerical information, use formal reasoning processes, practice computational skills, and apply mathematical concepts or formal reasoning to solve real‐world problems. Courses fulfilling this requirement must be at least college‐level and include mathematics and quantitative reasoning courses, including logic, statistics, computer programming languages, and related disciplines. (second reading)

4. Proposed Change to Board Policy P-7412 2.3.3.6 (proposed): Ethnic Studies (minimum of 3 semester/4 quarter units). Courses fulfilling this requirement may include baccalaureate‐level courses in the four autonomous disciplines within Ethnic Studies or introductory courses that survey the four areas: Black Studies; African American Studies; Africana Studies; Native American Studies; Chicano/a/x; Latino/a/x Studies/La Raza Studies; and Asian American Studies. (second reading).

5. Proposed addition to Board Policy P-7412 2.3.3.7.2 Students in majors with 45 units or more of required coursework may petition to be exempted from the Living Skills requirement. Each College shall set up a process to apply this exemption. (second reading)

Discussion for items 1-5:

* Concern: substantial changes have been made to the proposed policies in 2.3.8. Therefore, ARC does not feel comfortable voting today since their senate approved the previous version
  + Opinion expressed that it is not a substantial change, it is just a clarification.
* Concern: this body has not deliberated on the idea of allowing students who start before 2025-2026 to use IGETC or CSU GE Breadth
  + Idea: we could remove the IGETC and CSU GE Breadth and therefore remove 2.3.8
    - Agreement that this is a good solution
* Concern was expressed at FLC that adding the ability of students being able to apply at any of the 4 colleges for their degrees, this would increase counseling workload
  + Suggestion: counseling faculty could keep data on how this decision affects workload

| Issue: Approving proposed changes to Board Policies regarding degree requirements as a packet (Decision items 1-5 above) | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ARC** | |  | **FLC** | |
| Knirk | y |  | Wada | y |
| Lopez | y |  | Jensen | y |
| Sacha | y |  | Danner | y |
| Shubb | y |  | Cardwell | y |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRC** | |  | **SCC** | |
| Velasquez | y |  | Strimling | y |
| Wagner | y |  | Johnson | y |
| Anderson | y |  | Kirkpatrick | y |
| Crosier | absent |  | Petite | y |

6. Proposal to establish the BDP (Baccalaureate/BS Degree Program) Work Group (second reading)

Background: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/12Uk58nr-yTOXq4m7TJbETtCE2QBy4tvQFSRazg-WpUc/edit>

Discussion:

* FYI, Governor Newsom vetoed the bill that would have allowed community colleges to offer nursing BA programs, therefore nursing would not be an option for this project
* ARC has not yet gotten enough feedback from their faculty for them to vote on this item. Given meeting schedules/faculty hiring presentations, they won’t have time to gather feedback until November
* Is there a time concern on this?
  + No
* Clarification: we are just voting on whether to form an information-gathering team, correct?
  + Yes, that is correct
* The charter says faculty will be drawn from a variety of areas, but there are only two faculty per college. Suggestion: increase the number of faculty participants from each college
* The composition of this exploratory committee may have a big impact on the conclusions of this committee. Therefore, it is important for us to discuss the composition before we approve the committee
* Opinion: ast time this was discussed at DAS, the idea of a pilot project with one or two areas was brought up. This charter does not seem specific enough to move forward.
* Opinion: it may be more appropriate to ask this group to come back with documentation and information, rather than a recommendation. Then, we could bring those recommendations/documentation back to DAS for the local senates to discuss.
* Opinion expressed that the charter is not empowering the group to make a recommendation
* Opinion: “Next steps” is vague and could be construed as a charge to make a recommendation
* Suggestion that there be more specificity in the charter
* Opinion that the workgroup’s job will be to clarify their charter
  + Opinion that no, DAS is the workgroup that should clarify the charter
* We want to make sure that the resulting documentation is actually useful for DAS. This workgroup represents a lot of time and work, and we want to make sure we set this group up for success
* The question of whether a community college can offer a BA is very complicated and there are strict requirements. It is very narrow on which degrees are allowed. This would be a heavy lift. The membership should be drawn from interested faculty from areas that could even possibly have a BA. A small group of people will need to read the rules and figure out if this is even feasible in our district. Community college BA proposals are being shot down left and right by the CSUs.
* What if we change the name to the BA Degree Program Exploratory Group?
* Suggestion: why don’t we ask admin to do the feasibility study? They could read through all the rules and noncompete clauses, and bring back a much more narrow list of the areas that would even be eligible. They we could approach those areas to see if they are interested.
  + They could provide us with their research, the resources available, etc etc.
  + What is even the administrative will for this? What sorts of resources are the ready to commit in terms of faculty hiring, etc?

This item will be tabled. There was broad support for asking admin to do the initial work of exploring feasibility. Paula will develop a new proposal tasking admin with this work and bring it to the next DAS meeting.

7. Proposal to establish the Noncredit Feasibility Task Force (first reading)

Background: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SFI6jTdEFF-b5iIL5u3Z9AT36T-yDrOr8uX1yQjk1sk/edit>

Discussion:

* Perhaps “feasible” isn’t the right word, since this is already being done all over the state. However, we do want to get a sense of the administrative interest/capacity for this
* This will return for second reading

## Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. No reports

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Cluster Hiring Task Force
   1. Sac City shared experiences with “cluster hiring” approach
   2. Seemed to achieve the major goals
   3. Discussion of “bumps in the road”
      1. Looking into a task force/work group to focus on supplemental questions
      2. Outreach and recruitment was not done at the District level to augment traditional applicant pools
      3. Clearer process for training the hiring committees would help moving forward
   4. Clarification given on what “cluster hiring” is/does
      1. Signals to applicants and committee members the central nature of equity and diversity to our institutions
      2. Belief that this leads to a greater diversity in faculty applicants
   5. Previously, administrators brought the idea of cluster hiring to the Academic Senate presidents and wanted them to approve it without discussion, at the end of the semester. Interest in this being discussed thoroughly before implementing, as faculty hiring is a 10+1 issue.
   6. We need to ensure we offer robust onboarding/mentoring/support for the faculty we hire
   7. Will admin commit to spend the money to advertise broadly so that we can recruit a diverse pool? Will they commit to continuing to support new faculty with reassigned time for new faculty onboarding?
   8. Background: when Melanie Dixon was president of ARC, there was interest in cluster hiring at ARC, but there was resistance at the district.
   9. There had been an impression that if we did cluster hiring, it would have to be done in lock step with the other colleges in the district. We now know that the colleges can each do things differently and with different questions and timeframes. It’s good to have a districtwide conversation about it, but we may not need to reach an agreement on anything as a district. We can do it the way we want to do it at our individual colleges
   10. Could there be a question in the application that asks the applicants whether they applied because of the questions?
   11. Opinion that folks may be afraid of change
   12. Interest in re-tooling the “equity question” in the existing application, because it isn’t all that helpful currently
   13. Idea proposed: going back to admin to say “what you are calling “cluster hiring” is basically just some supplemental questions. Not interested in disingenuously asserting that “we are doing cluster hiring” when all we’re doing is improving our application process.
   14. Cluster hiring involves outreach, onboarding, and support for an intentional cohort of faculty
   15. Interest in seeing the suggested proposal in writing before approving
   16. SCC and ARC are already hoping to move forward with cluster hiring during the upcoming hiring season. It does seem like it would be helpful to discuss at a district level
       1. Idea: perhaps after we see the results of the ARC/SCC processes, we can discuss it more broadly next hiring season - would the district be willing to support us with better outreach and onboarding?
       2. Opinion expressed that we are not ready to roll this out districtwide.
   17. This is a good topic to bring into the upcoming discussion about rewriting the faculty hiring manual
   18. Cluster hiring is one method of increasing faculty diversity, not the only method.
   19. Again, the entire hiring process needs to be considered - before, during, and after. We need resources to support our new faculty
   20. CRC is interested in learning more about how it goes with ARC and SCC. They are not quite ready to do it themselves
   21. Summary: ARC and SCC are hoping to move forward, CRC and FLC are interested in paying attention to how it goes and considering it for next year
2. AI Summit
   1. A survey will be sent out to gauge interest in the AI summit and what topics people want to discuss
3. Faculty Hiring Manual revisions
   1. Moved to next meeting
4. Moratorium Issues
   1. The District has several replicas of Native American remains and cultural items that were taken during the moratorium. DAS feels those items should not have been taken as part of the moratorium process and should be returned. The district and the tribal partners feel the items should have been included in the moratorium The district has so far not been willing to return the replica items to the colleges/departments.
   2. Paula clarified DAS’ narrow understanding of the moratorium re: replicas and images to Jamey. (DAS’ understanding was that the moratorium included a prohibition on creating replicas or images of items under Los Rios control, but did not prohibit the use of all replicas or all images of Native American remains and artifacts.) Jamey asked if they could meet with James Crandall, the district’s NAGPRA liaison.
   3. Jamey says there is a legal obstacle to returning the items that, in DAS view, were improperly taken as part of the moratorium. Paula asked for the specific legal provision that would prevent the replicas from being returned. Jamey sent some items in support of the interpretation
      1. Opinion expressed: there is no legal obstacle that would prevent replicas from being returned to faculty
   4. Note: Los Rios has not repatriated any of our human remains; they are still in storage. The items we want back are in the same spaces as the Native American human remains. For the district, accessing these items poses a potential challenge because of the [NAGPRA “duty of care”](https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nagpra/upload/Duty-of-Care-FAQ.pdf) for Native American human remains and cultural items.
   5. Jamey had a meeting with the tribal partners, and offered to convey our clarification. Jamey also let the tribal partners know that it is extremely unlikely that replicas will be included in the Los Rios NAGPRA policy. The tribal partners stated that they did not share our interpretation, and that they thought it should include all replicas and images.
   6. Question: why hasn’t Jamey been willing to put the above in writing?
      1. Opinion: he has
      2. Opinion: no, he hasn’t
   7. Is the issue “duty of care” or is the issue the lack of agreement over the interpretation of the moratorium? In other words, is the district not returning the replicas because there is disagreement on whether they fit under the moratorium? Or, is the challenge that the replicas cannot be accessed because they are stored in the same rooms as Native American human remains and cultural items, and are thus impacted by the duty of care requirements?
   8. Opinion: This was our moratorium that we passed. When we passed it, we were told we could not change it. Admin took more items than were covered by the moratorium. DAS passed a resolution asking for those items back. Some items were returned, some were not returned. DAS asked again for the replicas to be returned. The tribal partners disagree with our interpretation. DAS President is being told that because they are in the same room as Native American human remains, they cannot be retrieved due to the “duty of care.” These are sacred spaces that have been blessed. It makes this issue very difficult and fraught.
      1. Opinion expressed that the “duty of care” is not actually in effect, due to the technical definition and certain steps not being taken yet.
      2. Confusion over why the “duty of care” is at issue. There were Australian and Peruvian replicas that were in the same room as the other replicas and in the same room as the human remains, and those were returned. Why can’t the other remains be returned?
   9. Point: when our NAGPRA policy is finalized, the moratorium will end. Our policy will follow NAGPRA/Cal NAGPRA, which does not encompass the replicas.
   10. Recently, SCC learned that books were removed from the library as part of the moratorium.
       1. Opinion: this is troubling.
   11. Request that DAS president ask for written clarification on what the specific legal obstacles are to returning the items
       1. Opinion expressed that this has already been requested and received
       2. Opinion: If it is the will of this body to make this request of the DAS president, we should write a resolution that we can all look at and potentially approve. This should not be a side request to the DAS president that comes from one member.
          1. Opinion: the DAS president is our liaison and representative. She is not our employee and we don’t get to boss her around.
   12. Not all faculty agree with wanting to insist that these replicas of human remains be returned.
   13. Concern with academic freedom for faculty. Also, concerned with what can this body do to support the task force so that the NAGPRA policy can be finalized and we can move forward?
       1. Opinion: the work that the NAGPRA task force has done to develop our policy has been one of the most difficult issues that faculty at Los Rios have had to grapple with
       2. Once the policy draft is finalized, it will come to DAS for approval, then will likely come to the Board for approval in the spring
   14. Opinion: Considering the “patience” that the tribes have had to endure for hundreds of years to be heard and have respect, it seems appropriate to take our time. College faculty are a very privileged demographic of people in many ways. Native American tribes have not had that kind of privilege.
   15. Idea: Ask Jamey for written clarification on how they were able to return those other replicas in March - was a certain process followed?
       1. Support expressed for this idea

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

* Interest in clarifying article 4 of the DAS bylaws regarding removing the DAS president
* CRC has an interest in looking at how Assumption of Risk Waivers are handled for classes with labs.

## Other Meeting Reports

1. Program Placement Council (PPC) - Paula
2. LRCFT - Jason Newman

## Future Returning Items:

1. Faculty hiring manual revision process
2. Long Term Temporary positions (LTTs)
3. Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP)
4. Equivalency processes
5. Strategic enrollment management plan
6. District Budget/LAO Report

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

1. Oct. 3: PREP Subcommittee 9 am
2. Oct. 7: DALMC Meeting 3:30 pm
3. Oct. 15: DAS Meeting 3-5 pm
4. Oct. 18: Area A Meeting/IEPI Meeting

## 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 |  |