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

**Tuesday, December 17th, 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
* 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
2. CRC Land Acknowledgement was read by Jacob Velasquez
3. Approval of Agenda
	* Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
	* December 3, 2024 DAS minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests

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

No public comments

## 7. DAS President’s Report

* IEPI Update
	+ DAS President met with Chancellor King prior to our DAS meeting. Needs feedback/direction from DAS (will come back to it in Discussion)
* Moratorium task Force Update
	+ Very close to winding down the work on the NAGPRA policy. Meeting tomorrow (12.18.2024); the committee has worked hard this term. Hope to bring back the policy to DAS.
* Risk Waiver Idea Ticket Update
	+ District has approved the idea and will look into how to implement this.
* PREP Update
	+ According to Chancellor King, there is no official decision. We can expect one by “late January.”

## Consent Items

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

* Proposed Charter: District Instructional Accessibility Committee
	+ This item will be pulled from Consent and added to a future agenda as a first read/second read
	+ Appreciation for the work of the DIAC group. Would love to see all the subcommittees come as a report to this body first so that we have a chance to see their work and potentially give feedback on the draft charter
	+ Problems accessing the membership document
	+ Request that there is more faculty representation
	+ Request to clarify what is meant by instructional faculty, and ensure there is enough representation of classroom faculty
	+ Request to re-iterate faculty responsibility to report back to constituents
	+ Concerned about “district administrator who will facilitate information sharing and decision making.” Concerned that this is a Senate subcommittee - the faculty are responsible for making the decisions.
	+ Also, a question regarding communication between meetings. Could be a Brown Act concern.
	+ Overall suggestion: It would be helpful if something like this were to come as a report, then the members could make comments directly in the document.

## 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. Updates coming to a guiding document
	2. All of the administrators and curriculum committees have agreed to appoint Common Course Numbering coordinators for Spring 2025.
		1. Alisa Shubb will serve as the District coordinator
		2. Two of the four colleges have identified local coordinators, and the other two will follow shortly
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
	1. No report
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy

Final meeting of 2024 was November 21. Planned launch dates for the following tools:

* + Zoom AI companion (planning for launch 1/6/25)
	+ Canvas Smart Search (planning for launch 1/6/25)
	+ Canvas Discussion Summary (planning for launch 1/6/25)
	+ Khanmigo (planning for launch 1/6/25)
	+ Training information to follow
1. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
	1. At the State level, there is a lot of concern that the RFA for the grant for Rising Scholars Network did not respect 10+1. The Statewide committee is getting together to analyze the data for the grant and writing a letter to the state Chancellor’s Office.
	2. Interest in balancing re-entry faculty with in-facility faculty. Request to admin to give them stipends to be able to pay part time faculty to serve on the committee. Will also look at the membership to make sure there is a balanced representation.
	3. Would like to clarify the relationship between admin and faculty on the committee
2. Ethnic Studies Council – Tami Cheshire - on hiatus
3. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
	1. No report
4. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
	1. No report

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

### Proposed Regulations R-7421 - Work Experience Education (First Reading)

* 1. Vivian specified what is required and what we have discretion on
	2. One area we have discretion on is the number of units we allow for Work Experience Education. The Work Experience Committee recommended 20 units total and no more than 12 units per semester.
	3. How do we make sure our students are not being exploited, particularly with the self-employment provision. Such as requests for students in the arts (e.g. videography) to work for free to get experience.
		1. No, this is not possible within the curriculum. Students would need to have an identified subject matter expert in the field who could verify their progress and hours. The Work Experience programs has both a student-facing side and an employer-facing side. The work is always for the protection and learning of the students. Employers would need to post that opportunity on Handshake, and there is a vetting process - they would need a business license, etc. They get a lot of inquiries about videography and photography, and the Handshake process screens them out. They do not want to promote opportunities where students are not learning and it is not a legit internship.
		2. Any experiential learning needs to be signed off by a Work Experience instructor of record. They ensure it is a learning experience and that it benefits the students.

## Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. No Reports

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

### Joint Committee on Education Technology

* 1. The Union is reporting a lot of faculty concerns around workload relating to AI: the time it is taking to detect AI, meeting with students to discuss inappropriate use of AI, learning how to use AI tools, interest in more professional development, questions about the tools and how the data we add to them is used, intellectual property, pedagogical questions, etc.
	2. A mechanism that is available in such cases is a joint committee between the Union and the Senate.
	3. If the Union goes forward with forming this group, they will ask for DAS reps
	4. Article 26 stipulates that we can have this joint committee. Language reads “the parties to this contract.” What does this mean? Who are the parties?
		1. The Union (LRCFT) and the District (LRCFT)
	5. Question: This group will work together to help *who* reach agreement over these issues?
		1. The Joint committee would form, create some agreements, and then how would it reach the agreements? Would the decisions go back to Senate?
			1. Assumption that the appointed DAS members would report back to DAS, and DAS would direct them on what they wanted to bring to the committee
			2. Perhaps we would make joint recommendations to the board on academic and professional matters related to AI.
		2. This Contract language has lain dormant for a long time, and it is a bit unclear. We can make of it whatever we agree that it is. It will be up to DAS how much they want Senate to be involved.

### IEPI - Menu of Options

* 1. Met with the IEPI committee in October. They have now created a menu of options, which is in supporting materials. The Senate presidents discussed this recently, and at that convening, they agreed they don’t want collegial consultation embedded into this thing. It is too important to stick into this process and there is a worry it will be declared “problem solved!” and everyone will move on. Don’t want it to get lost.
	2. General support for renewed IBA efforts. Many constituent groups are excited about it.
	3. The District will carve up the $200,000. How do we want to spend it? They need the DAS signature on the spending plan. Do we want collegial consultation included?
	4. Observation that this menu of options is thin. There are no models and examples present. How would these ideas actually look once implemented? It is unclear exactly what would result from the recommendation to, for example, “train the Board on collegial consultation.”
	5. Ultimately, this menu of options are just options. What counts is what we put on the next document where we lay out how we think we want to use the money.
		1. The Chancellor did not have a plan for how to create this document.
		2. Opinion: Request that we remove collegial consultation and request that whatever the district puts in this plan gets vetted by DAS. We should not hope for much from this process.
	6. $200,000 is not enough money to solve all the issues they lay out here in this document
	7. Opinion: strongly urge against making IBA mandatory for everyone who is new to the district. We would want to ask our faculty professional development groups for feedback on this
	8. Experience of admin taking over processes and then it becomes a power struggle. The tone around collegial consultation feels insincere/inadequate/uninformed. Opinion: If DAS says yes to this, they are just giving up more of their power. Interest in removing the parts about collegial consultation. Opinion: Administrators refuse to engage in healthy conflict resolution with faculty. Would support request for professional development for management but not for faculty
	9. We want the folks who write this next document - we want it to reflect our interests, which is in NOT including collegial consultation . We are OK with IBA but we are not going to pretend we have addressed collegial consultation. We could say, for example, “We want you to focus on Area A. That’s the only thing we’re interested in.”
	10. Request that IBA be more culturally relevant.
	11. Request to see the document before DAS President is asked to sign it.

### TES (Transfer Evaluation System)

Kim Goff (Director of Admin and Records at District) presented about the new Transfer Evaluation System.

* TES is a “College Source” product/database, which houses 190k different institutions course catalogues (Los Rios catalogues back to the 1990s).
* TES allows us to house a database of course equivalencies/course substitutions determined by faculty. Once a decision has been made, TES will house that decision for all future student determinations/decisions. This will be a vast improvement from a spreadsheet approach (what is most commonly used currently).
* Sac State (along with several other CSUs and UCs) uses TES.
* Plan is to roll out TES in the Spring for local degree equivalent decisions (only internal use initially). Down the line, other applications beyond a database, are possible and can be considered/discussed after initial internal roll out.
* Question: can you walk us through the process from start to finish (once a student requests a course equivalency/substitution)?
	+ Kim Goff: it depends on the local/campus process. At ARC, students are referred to a link to begin the process themselves. CRC has counselors handle the process. TES would take some work off of counselors. TES would route a request to an appropriate faculty member (often the department chair). Some people want it routed to the chair, some want it routed to other faculty. The list would be updated each semester with the Dean and dept chair. All faculty are in TES and requests can be rerouted if needed.
* Question: does the student or counselor or discipline faculty have access to the work flow of where the request is in the process?
	+ Yes. TES tracks everything with time stamps and names of folks responsible.
* Question: If a student took a class at UC Davis and it was approved by a Los Rios department as equivalent, will that show up in TES (across the four campuses)?
	+ Kim: Yes. You will see the history of a specific class. District would also see more information to help route requests. Initially TES will be college-specific, with four different profiles in TES. Eventually District wants to have a list available to all Los Rios campuses/departments.
* Question: What is the average turnaround time currently and how would TES change that?
	+ Kim: Anywhere from instant turnaround to a long time. On average it takes about 5 days while we’re in session. Out-of-session takes much longer. The processes can remain the same, the only difference is that the approvals are being routed by TES.
* What would the process be for how department chairs would opt out of using TES altogether?
	+ The District would hope that wouldn’t happen. It is a lot of manual labor to send the emails. But if a department absolutely does not want to use TES, the District admissions & records would send it in an email. Reiterating that TES is just a different system to accomplish the same process as before. TES is only used for internal tracking purposes.
* How would it work where the counselors are more involved? Would a counselor be able to auto-approve courses?
	+ No. They will refer the course to the departments for approval.
* What if a student brings a transcript that has a former version of a course. The fact that it was approved from 2021-2024, would it recognize that a student had taken the course a long time ago?
	+ It is catalog year-based. You would be looking at the catalog description from the year the student took the course.
* How was the decision made in the first place to move forward with the implementation of TES? What vetting through faculty has there been?
	+ This information previously went to Academic Senate and was also presented to Curriculum. It was vetted by faculty. An ongoing process has been happening with articulation officers from each college. Unsure as to exactly how the decision was made to adopt TES. It was a workgroup of District Equity and Student Success Committee. Did the decision to adopt TES come to the District Academic Senate? We are unsure. It was noted that this new process supports equity by ensuring that two students with the same course don’t end up getting two different answers as to whether an equivalency is approved. It was noted that students may still get different answers at different colleges.
* It sounds like no decision has been made to implement TES. Is that correct?
	+ The TES workgroup has not yet made a recommendation to implement TES. But the CRC President has heard that the decision to implement it has already been made and the process will start in February. Or, was this approved in 2021? We are not sure when and where the decision got made to use TES. TES was a faculty-driven initiative that predated the Admissions & Records redesign.

### Board Policy & Regulation 3412

* 1. When the DAS presidents met to discuss the Dec 17th agenda, they agreed to read this regulation
	2. The DAS members read Board Policy & Regulation 3412 out loud, round robin style.

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

* None

## Future Returning Items:

* Recommendation re: faculty on 2nd round hiring committees
* Recommendation to remove chatbot feature
* Faculty Hiring Manual Revisions: LTT Hiring Process
* Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP)
* Strategic Enrollment Management Plan
* District Budget/LAO Report

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

* Dec. 18: District Budget Meeting 3:30pm
* Dec. 18: Board of Trustees Meeting 5:30pm
* Dec. 20: Winter Break Begins
* Jan. 8: LRCCD Board Meeting
* Jan. 16-17: Spring 2025 Flex
* Jan. 21: DAS 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  |  |