

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, March 4, 2025 - 3:00-5:00 pm

Los Rios District Office Main Conference Room

[Remote Participation Link](#) Meeting ID: 852 1262 3490 Passcode: 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. ARC Land Acknowledgement was read by Brian Knirk
3. Approval of Agenda
 - Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
 - [Feb 18 2025 DAS minutes](#) were approved
5. Introduction of guests
 - David McCusker
 - Stacey Burrows
 - Richard Mowrer
 - Katy Wilson
 - Tressa Tabares

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

An ARC faculty member made public comment on the topic of the NAGPRA draft policy, and the way in which the harms are described. Shared examples of statements of harm from other contexts, and observed that these statements are often stark, clearly acknowledge who perpetrated the harms, and did not seek to defend why the harms were perpetrated. Opinion expressed that our NAGPRA policy's section on harms is not as clear, and seems to defend the past actions of Los Rios faculty in not returning NAGPRA items. Suggestion that we review the statement on harms in our NAGPRA policy and consider making it more clear.

7. DAS President's Report

- Update on Academic Calendar Committee discretion
 - Jamey Nye reiterated that there is not a lot of discretion on when the district observes certain holidays.
 - Please make sure to appoint engaged faculty members to the Academic Calendar Committee
- Communication re: students serving on hiring committees
 - Carrie Bray confirmed that yes, students need to take the Hiring the Best training
 - At ARC, a separate "Hiring the Best" training has been developed for students, and ARC admin says this version of the training is acceptable.
 - It will be a college-by-college decision on whether to pay students.
 - Suggested communication to Carrie Bray and Mario Rodriguez re: Students serving on Hiring Committees (this language could be modified by college as paying students will be a college decision):
 - "The District Academic Senate thanks Carrie Bray for reviewing the Los Rios Hiring Manual and confirming that all members of hiring committees, including student representatives, must complete the two-hour Hiring the Best training. Our student committee members will be better prepared and further engaged in this vital district process. The input and feedback student hiring committee members provide is invaluable to the committee. We recognize that participating in HTB training will require additional time for our student representatives, many of whom will miss classes and possibly time at their jobs in order to participate in 1-2 days of interviews. We ask that the district consider compensating our student hiring committee members for their participation on hiring committees. Ideally, students would be paid for both interviews and Hiring the Best training. We further recognize that this issue is not a 10+1 matter. Although this is by no means a formal recommendation, we do ask that the district carefully consider this request to compensate our student hiring committee members. Thank you very much for your consideration, The District Academic Senate."
- DAS exec team met with the Chancellor on 2/18

- 2/24 Chancellor's Cabinet update
 - Discussed the IEPI, the Woodland community college bill, and the ["Dear Colleague"](#) letter.
 - Discussed the high numbers of fraudulent applications and some potential solutions to the problem. 54% of applications are fraudulent. Less than 1% of applicants flagged for being fraudulent are "false positives" (ie real students). Deans currently have a roster of suspected fraudulent applicants and their W#s.
 - Do we know the number of fraudulent enrollments vs fraudulent applications?
 - Suggestion that we all be careful about language when we talk about this – clarify when we are talking about applications vs actual enrollments
 - The CCCs lost millions of dollars last year due to fraudulent enrollments. They also take up space in classes that real students could take.
 - If a student is flagged as fraudulent and removed from the class, is there a way for them to get re-enrolled?
 - Yes
 - Everyone is interested in getting this resolved as soon as possible so we can get our actual students enrolled in the classes they need

Consent Items

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

- Approval of remote attendees

Information Items

1. Chatbot issue update
 - a. In previous meetings, public comment was made on the inadequacy of the answers provided by the chatbots on the college websites
 - b. Paula is working with Gabe Ross on getting these issues resolved
 - c. After implementing some kind of AI solution, District say the "I don't know" rate is down from 35% (!!!) to just 5.7%, so things have improved somewhat
 - d. There have been over 7,000 live chats since August
2. DESSC Committee Appointments: Tera Reynolds, Libby Cook

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

- a. Meeting notes from the AB 1705 workgroup will be linked from the DCCC folder
 - b. The 2026 Catalog is being worked on. Deans & department chairs, watch for emails from your division offices with the changes in your area. There are many changes in the 2025-2026 catalog so please watch out for the email and check for any mistakes. The new catalog goes live on April 11, but it is not considered “official” until August 1, so if you see mistakes please forward them to your department chair so they can be fixed.
 - c. There are some glitches between SOCRATES and PeopleSoft. If you see errors in the class schedule, do not panic. We are working on fixing it.
 - d. Common Course Numbering (CCN) webinar happening this Friday, 1:30 - 2:30. CCN coordinators have sent out invites to departments that will be affected by Phase II. We expect Phase II templates soon. Phase III list was released recently. There are 47 courses on this list, and Los Rios has most of these courses in our district.
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
 - a. Discussed ICE training and issues for undocumented students
 - b. Discussed AI
 - c. Discussed the [Dear Colleague letter](#)
 - d. A&R update: more about ICE training and financial aid. Staff who work on public counters are going through Financial Aid literacy training
 3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. Canvas OKTA SSO is moving forward. This update will make sure we don’t have to sign in twice to access Canvas
 - b. Online grading system (OGS): there have been many requests for enhancements, particularly how rosters get updated. Manveer is collecting this information and is proposing a structure for a potential workgroup. There are a lot of issues that need to be worked through in terms of the OGS – the system uses very old code that not many people know how to update.
 4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
 - a. No update
 5. Ethnic Studies Council – Tami Cheshire - on hiatus
 6. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
 - a. No updates
 7. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
 - a. No updates

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. [R-7421 Work Experience Education Regulation](#) (Second reading)

Background:

-

Discussion:

- No discussion

Revision was approved unanimously, by consensus

2. Proposed revision [R-7151 International Education](#) (Second reading)

Discussion:

- No discussion

Revision was approved unanimously by consensus

3. District Instructional Accessibility Committee [proposal](#) to adopt the California Community Colleges Accessibility Center's Accessibility Capability Maturity Model (ACMM) — a framework designed to guide colleges and districts in advancing digital accessibility (Second reading)

Discussion:

- Requested clarifications:
 - There was an inquiry as to how the proposal might relate to the LRCFT's position on accessibility. Their position is something to the effect of, it is the district's responsibility to ensure materials are accessible, not the faculty member's responsibility. Interest in clarification around this issue
 - The purpose of doing it through the ACMM is that it is done with the participation of all the stakeholders, including LRCFT. Any policies/practices/recommendations would come out of Los Rios, which would include the Union, the classified staff, the faculty, etc. The recommended structures for a steering committee would be administrators, faculty, classified, student leadership, LRCFT, classified unions. The goal would be to work together to achieve consensus around how to move forward on accessibility.
 - CRC senate is comfortable moving forward with the proposal, but reserves the right to disagree with the plan that results from the proposal
 - Hopefully, this concern would not come to fruition, because ideally through the process we will work through concerns and disagreements and come to a workable solution that everyone can live with.

This was approved unanimously, by consensus

4. Request for DAS President Signature on IEPI Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (first reading)

Background:

- [IEPI Template](#)

Discussion:

- The first row under action steps says to “incorporate IBA training into new employee onboarding.” Recommend that this line is removed. Concern that providing IBA training to each new employee during onboarding, including all adjuncts, is not realistic. This is a three-day training, and new faculty will need to focus on preparing their classes. This type of training would be overwhelming for a new faculty member.
- We really should have had data about IBA and its effectiveness. How many people have gone through it? When IBA is used, what data is collected? Do we collect participant satisfaction on how well the IBA process worked?
 - Interest in tracking participant satisfaction if/when we implement IBA again. Also, tracking the timeliness of IBA requests – reports that some folks have requested IBA mediation and then had to wait months to get someone to mediate an IBA process.
- Observation that IBA failed us when we needed it most. There was an IBA process with the Chancellor that was not satisfactory. Then after 2020, the district unilaterally dropped IBA at the time when problems with the Chancellor started ramping up.
- Opinion that IBA is a great team building exercise but is less effective as a negotiation tool.
- Opinion that admin wants everyone to do IBA training, but they don’t actually want to follow the practices themselves
- What accountability is there for administrators if faculty ask for an IBA process and admin doesn’t follow through on providing one?
- Feedback loop should be specified – If we are going to collect feedback, what will be done with it?
- In the column of “Responsible persons,” one item says “TBD.” Can we get that clarified?
- Will IBA be something admin trots out only when they want to rubber stamp something?
- Opinion: not comfortable signing until the “new employee onboarding” item is removed, or clarified that this does not include faculty.
- Is there any onboarding for deans?
 - No
 - Maybe start with “Have employee onboarding.”
 - Would we really emphasize IBA training for deans over things like scheduling, PRTs, etc etc.
- In the second row, “Objectives,” concern expressed with the phrase “committee decision making.” Not knowing who the responsible people are – would this guideline end up applying to senate committees? Recommend striking the committee decision making or clarify what they mean by that.
 - “To Be Determined (Committee)” – we would need to make sure that this “TBD committee” has proper District Academic Senate representation.

- Has LRCFT seen this document? They are invoked where it says “collective bargaining negotiations.” It would be a good idea to share this document with LRCFT.
- Clarification needed/concern expressed with how IBA would be utilized in interdepartmental collaborations
 - IBA likely would not be imposed unilaterally - it would only be used if both parties wanted to use it

5. LRCCD Class Size Task Force Recommendations (first reading)

Background:

- [LRCCD Class Size Task Force Report](#)

Discussion:

- Background:
 - In 2021, DAS adopted a resolution regarding the impact of class size on instructors’ ability to engage in equitable practices.
 - A task force was chartered to investigate and advocate around this issue. Project deliverables were to establish criteria on setting class sizes
 - The committee met, worked on a draft, and then in Fall 2023, the group had to pause work due to the Davies Hall closure. Bringing it back now for DAS consideration.
 - The group recommends a Phase II task group to continue the work. The group had many productive and thoughtful discussions, and recommended a framework for moving forward, but did not have access to the kind of data necessary to put numbers in each of the columns of the taxonomy the way Santa Barbara did.
- Questions:
 - Where would physical limitations at particular campuses factor in? For example, perhaps one college is remodeling their music ensemble rooms and can’t accommodate the usual number of students
 - There could be a class size range offered, rather than a specific number
 - The maximum could always be lowered if needed - if there is only a small space available, the fire marshall guidance on room capacity would always take precedence.
 - Would this committee also be determining a “floor” on how many students were needed in order for classes to run? If so, that takes a lot of pressure off both the faculty wondering if their classes will run, and the deans who have to make those decisions.
 - Yes, the range idea could allow for this
- The policy language that does exist on this issue references “optimum” class size.
- Did we intentionally choose not to talk about modalities? Would modalities make a difference in class size recommendations? Also, the conversation about syncflex, and the additional workload that would be involved in syncflex
 - In the opinion of the task force, the criteria for class size should primarily take into account the teaching methods outlined in the COR, and this does not change by modality

- The group recognizes there is academic freedom to teach one's class differently. Syncflex is not a modality, it is a pedagogical choice.
- What does this look like for people who request double size classes?
 - Large lectures are described in the document
- Observation: class size has been determined by mythology and lore, not policy. Once developed, this new document would give us a starting point for a policy.
- Was their LRCFT representation in this group?
 - Yes
- Officers are asked to bring this document to their individual senates, and this will be discussed at second reading once all the colleges are ready.

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee: AB 607 Compliance Measures

- [Resources](#) from “No Hidden Fees” Spring 2025 Flex Presentation

Discussion:

- Andi shared a presentation on the need for cost transparency for our students and the specific ways faculty are suggested to report the costs: [DALMC: Creating Cost Transparency for Students](#)
- Could some of the costs be listed in the program descriptions for degrees where we know there are classes that require costs? Answer: The [AB 607 legislation](#) specifically requires information to be published “on the online campus course schedule” so students have a clear understanding of costs before they register. You could write a generic section note that links to the program description. Example: There are additional expenses up to \$50 for course requirements. Details are outlined in our XX program description. (The XX program description would link to the specific area that outlines what students need to purchase).
- Question about lab fees: what are the rules around assessing lab fees? Previously it was if students would walk away with a tangible item, such as printed photographs
 - Answer: That is correct. This is stated in the [CCCCO Student Fee Handbook](#) (Appendix A, P. 52). A lab fee may be implemented for materials that students use to create objects they take home. Specifically, when materials like clay, film, canvas, paint, etc., are transformed into personal projects. Conversely, the district should provide materials used solely for practice that remain school property without a fee. Therefore, when students produce items they will keep, a lab fee is often necessary to cover the cost of these materials. If faculty feel a lab fee is the best way to facilitate needed supplies (rather than having students buy the material themselves through the bookstore or another vendor), they should work with their deans to set up appropriate budgetary processes through the

business office. This ensures that lab fees paid through eServices are allocated to the specific department budgets for which they are intended.

- Cost notes could give a range, such as “students will need to purchase art materials costing between \$25 - \$50.”

2. Ad Hoc AI Committee Proposal

- [Proposed DAS Ad Hoc AI Coordinating Committee](#)

Discussion:

- Is DAS interested in forming an AI task force? If not, DESSC is interested in forming an AI task force.
 - Opinion that DESSC is well-positioned to take this on, since they give input into policies and there are a lot of student services faculty on the committee
 - Nothing would preclude DAS from taking this issue up in the future if we wished
- Opinion - Would like to see a more focused committee charge if DESSC takes this on
- Interest in collaborating on professional development around AI. Noted lack of districtwide professional development committee
 - Opinion: unsure if DESSC is the right group to take on professional development recommendations
- Clarification that DESSC would create an ad-hoc AI committee, the main DESSC body would not do this work

3. Hiring Committees (how campuses approach, where administrations differ)

- Concern that we are getting multiple streams of communication and multiple voices on the same issues, and it's unclear what information is correct
- Carrie Bray asked when faculty would like to revise the [faculty hiring manual](#). DAS President indicated we would like to do this work as soon as possible.
- Would be great to see a proposal for a hiring manual revision task force at the next DAS meeting
- Question: how should we resolve the current questions, such as which version of the Hiring the Best training students will take? It seems like some institutions have not been following the hiring manual.
 - i. People interpret the hiring manual to suit their own purposes, so one goal of the revision process should be to make the processes crystal clear
 - ii. Do students rank in the interview process? The hiring manual says “all committee members rank” but does this include students?
 1. It is not clear whether students rank
- Suggestion: put a copy of the hiring manual into a Google doc and share it with DAS, and invite DAS to make comments on areas that are unclear

- Can we look at some data with respect to where we are with diversity in hiring?
- Questions around hiring full time vs adjunct vs LTT - would be ideal if the processes for each of these were outlined
- Idea: include a discussion of the roles for each committee member: what does the administrator need to do? Equity rep? Content expert? Etc

4. Los Rios [Faculty Hiring Manual](#) Revision

- Clarification of student role/training
- Faculty Equity Rep on second-round interview panel
- Clarification of LTT hiring process
- Equivalency issues

5. [Dear Colleague](#) letter

- Some Senates at CCCs are taking positions on this letter. Is our Senate interested in taking a position?
- District position is that nothing will change based on this letter

6. Position on [SB 226](#): “Community colleges: territory transfers between districts.”

- Is DAS interested in taking a position on this?

7. Mid-year Collegial Consultation Report

- [Draft - Mid 2025 CCR](#)
- Opinion that consultation has been better this semester
- Opinion that the Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings in Fall were not terribly productive. The chancellor showed up and said “What do you want to know?”
- Concerns about the recent space utilization surveys - there were no open ended questions, and it was not clearly explained what the goal of the process was.
- Facilities Master Plan could have been signalled better. The colleges received very sudden, unclear notice that they were going to be reviewing the FMP and needed faculty input
 - i. ARC’s space utilization survey contained several inaccuracies
- There should have been notice in writing that the safety group would be forming what the charge was, what representation was needed, etc
- Request to note that DAS had to fight to get consultation on the IEPI process. Consultation has been going well but it didn’t start off with good consultation
- Note that collegial consultation needs to happen with our VPAs

- Vocational ESL as “not for credit” vs non-credit - wouldn't this fall under educational program development in 10+1. We are putting a Los Rios stamp on curriculum that we have had no hand in developing.

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Other Meeting Reports

1. Program Placement Council (PPC) - Paula
2. LRCFT - Jason Newman
3. AB 1705 Math Implementation

Future Returning Items:

- R-3412 Proposed revision to strike-through Competency Committee language (Second reading)
- R-7241 Proposed revision to strike-through Competency Committee language (Second reading)
- R-7241 Proposed change to allow continuing students to use any GE pattern to satisfy local AA/AS degree requirements (Second Reading)
- Baccalaureate Degree Exploration/Feasibility
- Noncredit Feasibility
- Proposal to amend District Academic Senate by-laws: Article 11, Section 2
- District Math AB705 Task Force

Upcoming Meetings / Events

1. Mar. 3, DALMC, 3:30
2. March 3, The March in March, 2 pm
3. March 4, DAS Meeting 3-5 pm
4. March 6, PREP Committee 9 am
5. March 12, LRCCD Board Meeting, 5:30 pm
6. March 17-21: Spring Break (WOOHOO!!!)
7. March 21: Area A Meeting
8. April 24-26, ASCCC Spring Plenary, Irvine

Land Acknowledgements

[Los Rios Community College District Indigenous Land Acknowledgment Statement](#)

“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](#)

“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](#)

“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](#)

“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](#)

“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: whether to make approving the DAS president a first/second read			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	y	Wada	n
Lopez	y	Jensen	n
Sacha	y	Danner	n
Shubb	y	Cardwell	abstain
CRC		SCC	
Velasquez	y	Strimling	y
Wagner	y	Johnson	n
Anderson	y	Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	absent	Petite	y

Issue: whether to make approving the DAS president a first/second read			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	y	Wada	n
Lopez	y	Jensen	n
Sacha	y	Danner	n
Shubb	y	Cardwell	abstain

CRC		SCC	
Velasquez	y	Strimling	y
Wagner	y	Johnson	n
Anderson	y	Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	absent	Petite	y

Issue: whether to make approving the DAS president a first/second read			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	y	Wada	n
Lopez	y	Jensen	n
Sacha	y	Danner	n
Shubb	y	Cardwell	abstain
CRC		SCC	
Velasquez	y	Strimling	y
Wagner	y	Johnson	n
Anderson	y	Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	absent	Petite	y

Issue: whether to make approving the DAS president a first/second read			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	y	Wada	n
Lopez	y	Jensen	n
Sacha	y	Danner	n
Shubb	y	Cardwell	abstain

CRC			SCC	
Velasquez	y		Strimling	y
Wagner	y		Johnson	n
Anderson	y		Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	absent		Petite	y