

# District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

**Tuesday, April 1, 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

### 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
- Lori Petite, Past President

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. CRC Land Acknowledgement was read by Lauren Wagner
3. Approval of Agenda
  - There was a motion to host two readings of the decision Item "Reaffirmation of DAS President." The motion passed. The discussion at today's meeting will be the first reading, and we will do the second reading at the April 15 meeting.

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
<b>CRC</b>		<b>SCC</b>	
Velasquez	y	Strimling	y
Wagner	y	Johnson	n
Anderson	y	Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	absent	Petite	y

- With the adjustment to decision item 1, Reaffirmation of DAS President as described above, the agenda was approved
- 4. Approval of Minutes
  - [March 4, 2025 DAS minutes](#) were approved
- 5. Introduction of guests
  - Dr. Norman Lorenz, SCC

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

No public comments

## 7. DAS President's Report

- DAS 5 Meeting with VC/AVCs on March 4
  - Fraudulent enrollment
  - Idea of online exchange with courses in Ghana
  - Chancellor search
  - Counselor workload - new regulations are creating additional workload for counselors. Challenges with managing the various roles of success coaches, peer mentors, counselors - where does one role begin and the other end?
- March 21 Area A Meeting update
- March 24 Chancellor's Cabinet update
- March 24 SUJIC update

## 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. March 12, 2025 DAS Report
2. Plenary Information
  - a. April 24-26; Irvine, California
  - b. DAS Budget String
  - c. [Registration Information](#)
  - d. Hyatt Regency Irvine (Reservation cut-off is April 3!)

## 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. Please continue to check and report errors in the online catalog - we expect there will be errors. There have been major changes and lots of manual edits. Please help us find mistakes. Report catalog mistakes to your dean and your local curriculum chair, or follow your local process. At each college, faculty will have received instructions on how to report catalog mistakes at their college.
  - b. Common course numbering phase I courses are showing up correctly in Socrates and in the class schedule. Note that English is now ENGL, rather than ENGWR. Phase IIa is in progress. Phase IIb, they are waiting for templates. Phase III is underway.
    - i. Is the new course information not getting over to Follett properly?
      1. This may be an issue. We may have overlooked the issue of transferring the information to Follett. Renee will let AVC Frank Kobayashi know that we need to address this.
    - ii. Coordinators are not being alerted about catalog changes. Renee will make sure they are getting the information.
  - c. Discussions are underway about the idea of eliminating cross-listing courses. There is no mechanism to cross-list common course numbering courses. Therefore, we will consider disallowing this practice in the district overall.
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
  - a. Working on the AI task force charter
    - i. Will the task force be a subcommittee, or a workgroup?
      1. It will be a workgroup
  - b. CalGETC and CCN updates
  - c. Update about admissions & records redesign
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
  - a. There has been a delay in integrating Canvas into Okta. They are aiming for making the announcement at the end of April and implemented after the semester ends. They do not anticipate issues or delays.
  - b. They are looking at Online Grading System replacement options. The current grading system was built in a very old architecture called PERL. Interest in expanding functionality and options, such as adding preferred names, student photos, group email options, ease of use, etc. The IT department will start a process of gathering faculty input/pain points, such as a survey and faculty focus groups. IT will create a group to carry out this project. Interest in integrating online grading system and Canvas

- i. Suggestion to look at what other institutions are doing and what the Canvas/OGS system looks like, such as Sierra, Sac State, UC Davis
- 4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
  - a. At Plenary, there will be several items related to PREP. There is a resolution asking for the State Chancellor's Office to encourage the colleges around their use of funds related to Rising Scholars. Interest in strengthening the role of the Senate and 10+1 in the Rising Scholars programs. The budget processes seem unclear for the Rising Scholars programs at Los Rios. Who is deciding how the money will be used, and how do they decide? Colleges are funding their Rising Scholars/Re-Entry faculty coordinators differently.
- 5. Ethnic Studies Council – Tami Cheshire - on hiatus
- 6. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
  - a. In March, the UDA Coordinators were notified that Los Rios will eliminate the A-Team, the group that was being used for document remediation. [Here is the rationale letter](#) from the District Office explaining the decision.
  - b. There is a goal to transition to an outside vendor at the end of Spring 2025. Concerns expressed about the decision to dissolve the A Team without prior consultation. Committee members requested details on how the decision was made. Interest in preserving this expertise within Los Rios, so that we have in-house knowledge needed to do this work.
  - c. The district answered that some members of the A-Team would remain on staff, and the UDA coordinators. interest in maintaining in-house accessibility experts in Los Rios. Building knowledge and capacity among faculty is essential to reducing costs and reliance on remediation - people need to learn how to do it themselves so that documents don't need to be remediated in the first place.
  - d. We do currently use a company (code mantra) to do outside remediation. We need to do a thorough RFP to find a good vendor. Committee would like DAS help in requiring faculty discipline experts in areas with more complex document accessibility issues, such as math and art. Would also like to recruit classified staff members to be part of the RFP team.
  - e. Another justification for moving to an outside vendor was the need for additional expertise in the more complex remediation needs
  - f. Comment: UC Davis has employed a tool called Sensus Access. It is integrated into Canvas and allows for much more streamlined accessible document creation, for both students and faculty. Suggestion that we look into this tool for Los Rios. Comment that when looking for tools that students can use, it may be useful to chose tools that are able to integrate into Canvas, which students are already familiar with.
    - i. Concern/question around what these remediation companies do with the learning materials and documents they remediate. Is there ultimate business model creating a new wave education technology that will replace humans?
- 7. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
  - a. No updates

## Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

- Reaffirmation of District Academic Senate President (first reading)

Background:

- According to Article 3, Section 1 of the [DAS Bylaws](#), the DAS President “shall serve a two-year term, beginning after the last regularly scheduled DAS meeting in the spring. The second year of the President’s term is subject to confirmation by the majority vote of the members of the DAS.”

Discussion:

- Observation that confirming the DAS president can be an awkward and nebulous conversation. Suggestion that we establish criteria for confirming the DAS President. The DAS President’s job description is fairly basic. Beyond the job description, here are some suggestions for criteria we could adopt:
  - Faithfully represent the will of the body
  - Equally and accurately represent for all four colleges
  - Establish effective agendas
  - Facilitate inclusive and effective meetings
- It was noted that we could also consider amending our bylaws and not do a confirmation for the DAS President
- Observation that in the last 10 years, we have only had two DAS Presidents who have served 2 years. All others have served 1 year or less.
- Observation that there is a process outlined in our bylaws for removing the DAS President
- Disagreement that we all need to agree on the same criteria. Concern that establishing criteria would create groupthink
- Opinion that we need to be willing to listen to each other; criteria focuses things on the work and not the individual.
- Agreement that if we are going to do a confirmation, it would be helpful to have criteria.
- Opinion that confirmation criteria is not needed, since there is an option to remove a DAS President. Why make the confirmation more complicated than necessary?
- Observation that faculty receive reviews and feedback from their students, which is part of helping faculty grow.
- Unlike the leadership of the Academic Senate Presidents, the DAS President is not elected. They are appointed in a unique way through a rotation process.
- Opinion: Don’t disagree with establishing criteria, but we are on a tight timeline and there may not be enough time to establish criteria. Could we consider criteria in the next revision of the bylaws?
  - Clarification/opinion that we could establish the criteria just for this decision item.
- Opinion: uncomfortable with establishing criteria for the DAS President at this time. We have already delayed this process. It is not the right time in the process to create criteria. At this point, we all have our own criteria and we need to make our individual decisions based on our individual criteria.

- R-3412 Proposed revision to strike-through Competency Committee language (Second reading)

Discussion:

- No discussion

Revision was approved unanimously by consensus

- R-7241 Proposed revision to strike-through Competency Committee language (Second reading)

Discussion:

- No discussion

Revision was approved unanimously by consensus

- R-7241 Proposed change to allow continuing students to use any GE pattern to satisfy local AA/AS degree requirements (Second Reading)

Discussion:

- No discussion

Revision was approved unanimously by consensus

- Request for DAS President Signature on IEPI Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (second reading)

Background:

- [IEPI Revision w/Edits](#)

Discussion:

- Additions in red - how did those come about?
  - DAS President reviewed the minutes and summarized the feedback from the body, and wrote the additions
- Approved unanimously DAS President to sign the plan with the changes

- Proposed Faculty Hiring Manual Task Force (First reading)

Background:

- Link to hiring manual

Discussion:

- Last hiring manual revision was done in the midst of COVID.

- HR is in complete agreement that we need to revise the hiring manual
- Borrowed the proposed structure from the last revision process
- Someone heard a rumor that LTTs aren't being used anymore
  - DAS President has not heard this rumor
  - The hiring process for LTTs is unclear and inconsistent across the district.
- Consider whether you'd suggest any changes to this document
- Consider who to appoint from your college for this task force. That person should be ready to work! It will be a labor-intensive process.
- The work will begin at the end of this semester.
  - Can individuals get ESAs to do the work over the summer? Yes.
- Interest in starting the work soon, so that the last hiring cycle is fresh in everyone's minds.
- This is a lot of work. Compensation may be appropriate for individuals who work on this task force. People who served on the NAGPRA task force got compensation.
- Would be ideal to get appointments by the end of the term.

## Proposed Fall 26 District Convocation Task Force (First reading)

### Background

#### [Fall 2026 District Convocation Task Force Draft](#)

- Presentation by Norman Lorenz arguing for a Districtwide convocation in Fall 2026
- Questions about where this idea came from: was it faculty-driven?
  - Combination of individual faculty interest and interest from SCC's College president. This idea has not yet been discussed at the SCC Academic Senate. Also has not been discussed broadly at any other campus, though campus PD leaders from each college did discuss the idea. This idea has been shared with the DO admin and they support the idea.
- If we move forward with planning a districtwide convocation, which college would host? ARC has larger facilities and has hosted the last 2 district convocations
- We will have a new Chancellor by this point
- We will have done the HOTEPA equity reviews and the space utilization studies. It may be a good time to get all the colleges together.
- Seeking faculty appointments to this group
- Is the District Convocation a faculty-led idea?
  - SCC's College President is interested in discussing all the campus-wide initiatives (such as the HOTEPA reports and space utilization studies, and doesn't want to do it over Zoom).
  - Norman Lorenz discussed the idea with district admin, who support the idea
  - DAS President agrees it is a good idea
  - Sense from Norman Lorenz that there is a strong need to coordinate district wide on the upcoming initiatives
  - In the past when we've had district convocations, who has planned them?
    - The District PIO office has planned them
- Historically, we have done districtwide convocations when the District has wanted to have them. This time, a small group of faculty are interested in pursuing the idea of a districtwide convocation. Interest in re-launching PD in the district.

- Opinion that much of our PD for the last 5 years has been compliance-based. Interest in revitalizing professional development with a focus on pedagogy– what WE want to do rather than initiatives that are coming down from someone else.
- The last district convocation was at ARC. The Ethnic Studies group had a grant and wanted to do an all-day professional development Plenary session. District offered to take the money and apply it to convocation, and they had an Ethnic Studies panel. A convocation costs money, and in the planning, recognize that administration would have ultimate veto power of the entire idea, and likely has their own agendas and ideas. The new chancellor may have their own thoughts as well.
- ARC has a robust Center for Teaching and Learning. We have pedagogical experts in-house. Sense that ARC is leaning into pedagogy already.
- Observation that this recommendation is coming from one campus. Thought that there needed to be two campuses who brought something to DAS
  - There was a group that met to talk about this idea, with representation from each college. It did not come from SCC.
- Observation that students are now Los Rios students, and they can choose to get a degree from any college.
- Clarification: Norman and the PD officers from all four offices met with Jamey to talk about a possible Districtwide Convocation
- Like the idea of using the HOTEP and Space Utilization studies to build a convocation program.
- Appreciation expressed for prior district convocations where faculty got to meet their colleagues in their parallel departments across the district.

## Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. District response to Noncredit Feasibility Inquiry
  - Districts position is “we can do this.” If we want to move forward, the mechanisms exist in SOCRATES to do so.
  - Some pushback from faculty on the counseling piece. Our counselors are under an incredibly high workload at the moment with the need to create Ed plans for everyone, and adapt to all the new initiatives which affect counseling.
  - Sense that some of the questions weren’t answered all that well. For example, where would the money come from to support all this? Decisions about existing FTE...how would we allocate the existing FTE to also account for noncredit? Would that divide the FTE pie into smaller sections?
    - Understanding that the decisions would be made at the department level. The department could choose to use their FTE to offer noncredit courses. Departments could choose to not offer noncredit. Faculty would get paid at the same rate.
  - Concern with counseling aspect and the statement that noncredit doesn’t require prerequisites, therefore it is “more equitable.” Opinion that prerequisites promote equity by ensuring that students get the education they need at a level that makes sense for them.
  - concern from counseling that people other than counselors will be able to do student ed plans. How will we support our counseling colleagues with this concern?



- This was discussed at SUJIC - We need definitions, job descriptions, and duty statements for success coaches, advisors, and counselors.
- Counselors have concerns about the changes to Title V and how that will affect counselors. For example, the 900:1 ratio is too high. The 900:1 ratio is meant to be the maximum that a college should ever have, not the best practice.
- Observation that we cannot move forward with a noncredit pilot until there is an MOU with LRCFT - it will require contract negotiations.

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- CRC President was informed recently that CRC will be moving forward with “a pilot program” that will change the hiring process for adjunct faculty. It is a three-part proposal that the VPI informed them of. Roughly speaking, it changes the composition of the interviewing and screening criteria for adjunct hiring. It allows for changes such as two departments combining to do a joint hiring process, where they will do combined equivalency determinations. VPI asserted that deans had already been informed of it and they are planning to move forward. CRC President asked VPI to hold off on implementing this process, and he agreed. CRC Academic Senate will discuss this at their next meeting.
  - Observation that several of these items run afoul of the current hiring manual. Processes for hiring faculty must be mutually agreed upon by faculty and admin.
  - College administrators cannot just ignore the hiring manual.
  - How did they “get permission to pilot” this process?
    - HR gave permission
      - Can we ask HR about this?
  - Could this have to do with the HOTEK equity process?
    - Unknown. Maybe?
    - Advice to go through the HOTEK report with a fine-toothed comb. A lot of the survey data they presented was not anonymized sufficiently, and it was possible to determine which individuals made certain comments. Example, people described their departments, and time stamps were left in, which made it possible to figure out who said what.
  - Request to follow up with this CRC hiring issue at the next DAS meeting

## Other Meeting Reports

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

## Future Returning Items:

- LRCCD Class Size Task Force Recommendations
- Baccalaureate Degree Exploration/Feasibility
- Noncredit Feasibility
- Proposal to amend District Academic Senate by-laws: Article 11, Section 2

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

1. April 3, PREP, 9:00 am
2. April 7, DALMC, 3:30
3. April 9 LRCCD Board Meeting, 5:30 pm
4. April 15, DAS, 3-5 pm
5. April 18, PPC, 2:30 pm
6. April 21, DESSC, 2:30 pm
7. April 21, DIAC, 3:00 pm
8. April 24-26, ASCCC Spring Plenary, Irvine
9. April 24, EdTech, 3 pm
10. April 25, DCCC, 2:30 pm
11. April 28, Chancellor's Cabinet, 3:00 pm

## 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:
--------

ARC			FLC	
Knirk			Wada	
Lopez			Jensen	
Sacha			Danner	
Shubb			Cardwell	
CRC			SCC	
Velasquez			Strimling	
Wagner			Johnson	
Anderson			Kirkpatrick	
Crosier			Petite	