

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, April 15, 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
3. Approval of Agenda
 - Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests
 -

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

7. DAS President's Report

- The DAS Exec team met with Chancellor & vice chancellor and received initial feedback on NAGPRA draft from tribal partners
- UDL coordinators will stay in place until at least Spring 2026.
- The in-house accessibility support team, the "A-team" will be disbanded. The decision was based on feedback about poor turnaround time and an inability to handle more complex requests, particularly in STEM
 - The District is seeking a vendor to provide accessibility remediation. Senate presidents are seeking volunteers to serve on the review/RFP team.
 - Request for clarification: a DAS member was told by Jamey Nye that in fact the A-team is not being disbanded, and this was a misunderstanding on the part of the Academic Senate. Which is accurate?
 - DAS President will seek clarification
- Regarding the question of how to offer noncredit courses in Los Rios, talks are underway with District.
 - This work on noncredit may require input from the Program Placement Council - when multiple colleges offer the same program, there is a process to make sure there is alignment and not too much overlap
- Chancellor's search update. The Board has chosen an educational consulting firm, [PPL Inc.](#) to help run the hiring process.

Consent Items

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

- Approval of remote attendees

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. CCN update: there is a strong need for outreach to students to educate them about the course numbering changes. Looking into getting a banner on the schedule of classes. For example, ENGWR has changed the designator for several courses to ENGL, so if someone [searches in the Fall 2025 class schedule or ENGWR 300](#), they find 0 courses.
 - b. Known issues with STAT 300 and ENGWR 302 at FLC - these not appearing in the schedule the way they should. Admin need to look into this
 - c. Please look for issues in your disciplines and report them to Alisa Shubb, or follow the process outlined at your college to report CCN-related issues.

- d. Request to bring up with local senates – might there be interest in folks applying for streamlined type b leave to work on CCN curriculum issues?
 - e. Still waiting on templates for some of the Phase II courses
 - f. Some concerns with articulation if a course is converted to the CCN COR - these CCN courses do not come with a guarantee of articulation.
 - g. Question: Is the fact that disciplines can opt out of CCN being communicated to faculty? Sense that this is being discussed as a mandatory initiative.
 - i. We should plan for ways to improve our communication to faculty on this issue.
 - h. Could a college maintain the same class, one version as CCN and one version with the old numbering?
 - i. No, there can't be the same exact class with different numbers. But departments have the ability to offer a variety of curriculum, and nothing is stopping a department from keeping the old numbering.
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
 - a. Working on charter for AI task force.
 3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. No 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 update
 7. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
 - a. No update

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Reaffirmation of DAS President (second reading)

- This item was presided over by Wayne Jensen while the DAS president exited the room

Issue: Whether to confirm the DAS President for a second term		
ARC		FLC

Knirk	y	Wada	y
Lopez	abstain	Jensen	y
Sacha	abstain	Danner	y
Shubb	abstain	Cardwell	N/A
CRC		SCC	
Velasquez	n	Strimling	y
Wagner	y	Johnson	y
Anderson	y	Kirkpatrick	y
Crosier	y	Petite	y

2. Proposed LRCCD Class Size Task Force Recommendations (second reading)

Background: [Link to LRCCD Class Size Task Force Report V2](#)

Discussion:

- If DAS accepts these recommendations, we would create a taxonomy of courses and use that taxonomy to make recommendations for class sizes.
- If DAS were to approve the formation of this group, we would alert the district that we will be convening this task force and making related recommendations. There's a possibility that the district would want to participate. We would hope that the district would take our recommendations, though they are not required to. It would also necessitate some coordination across the district - currently, class sizes can vary widely across the district.
- Question: why would we need administrators on a senate-led committee? Would their participation be substantive? Is the district open to taking the Senate recommendations?
- Question: Might the task force check with the Office of Institutional Research to see if they have any relevant data.
 - Since we're tying the pedagogy to the CORs, we don't differentiate modality. To then have different standards per modality would not fit with connecting pedagogy to CORs.
- Concern about class sizes as they relate to the curriculum and assignments in certain types of courses. For example, in a COMM course with an oral speaking component where students are required to speak for a certain duration of time – are these types of requirements reflected in the class size considerations?
- Courses are being made more uniform across the district as part of the CCN process. Should class size be consistent across the district as well?

- Clarification that the taxonomy presented here is more of an example – it may be changed and revised after more robust discussion
- There was a concern at CRC about having a particular category for oral communication classes in the taxonomy and whether this was taken seriously. Could this be included in the document as well?
- If courses are taught differently at different colleges, there could be a justification for different class sizes or ranges at different colleges.
- Other variables that could create a class cap are space limitations in specific classrooms. The ideal number might be 28, but a classroom may only seat 26.
- Concern with one-size-fits-all class size recommendations across the district. Opinion that such uniformity is not equitable.
- Suggestion that we ask our institutional research departments to investigate whether there is a class size/or range that is most correlated with student success and with closing equity gaps.

Issue: Accept the proposed LRCCD Class Size Task Force recommendations, with a friendly amendment to include COMM in the taxonomy			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	abstain	Wada	y
Lopez	abstain	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	y	Petite	y

Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1.

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. District Response to Noncredit Feasibility

Discussion:

- A few years ago, an initial DAS group thought noncredit sounded promising, but wasn't sure it was feasible for our district. DAS recommended forming a noncredit feasibility task force. The task force completed their work in September, 2023, recommending a series of groups be formed to further investigate the feasibility of noncredit.
- Last fall, DAS directed the district to provide us with more information regarding the feasibility of noncredit from the perspective of the district aspects like enrollment, financial aid, etc.
- Many of the concerns about noncredit have to do with the impacts noncredit courses would have on counseling faculty and counseling departments. However, the district didn't do a great job addressing the feasibility of the counseling aspects. If the district said "yes this will be fine for counseling" but would we trust this determination?
 - Would probably be better to ask the counselors directly.
 - Recommend to bring this up with the counselors at your college to get feedback on feasibility.
- Note: There are no "additional" FTE allocations specific to noncredit. It is up to each department whether to allocate FTE to noncredit. The FTE comes from existing departmental FTE.
- We can't move forward with any of this without some MOU between LRCFT and LRCCD. We need to answer questions such as:
 - How is noncredit attributed to load?
 - If I develop and teach "Fun Times and Skills 101," Is this the same as teaching Calculus or English Writing? The problem with noncredit in the past has been pay disparity. But there are lots of ways that pay disparity can end up looking like.
- Belief expressed that the best way to start getting answers to these questions would be to simply move forward on offering noncredit.
- Clarification regarding pay disparity: the district agreed to only teach noncredit courses ("enhanced noncredit") for which *they* will get paid the same as for regular credit courses. The issue of *faculty* pay with noncredit has not been determined.
- DAS President will go back to the faculty section and flesh it out with the questions about compensation, etc. Will reach out to LRCFT and see where the Union is at on this issue. Also will ask questions like "where does non credit fit into the student funding formula?" Then will bring it back to DAS for additional review.
- It was noted that noncredit courses must be tied to a certificate (a noncredit certificate). We can't just offer standalone noncredit courses
- Suggestion: find the CC faculty contract that has the best faculty terms for noncredit, and bring that to the district to see if they will agree to it.

2. NAGPRA: Initial Feedback from Tribal Partners

- Initial feedback from the tribal partners is that our policy has parts of it that deal with NAGPRA compliance, but also a lot of parts that deal with internal Los Rios processes regarding non-Nagpra items. The tribes would like our NAGPRA policy to only focus on the NAGPRA compliance.
 - For example, they are not terribly interested in our internal policies such as procurement of instructional materials.
- The Los Rios NAGPRA Task Force is interested in ensuring that their recommendations, even the ones regarding non-NAGPRA items, are enshrined in policy - as opposed to ending up as verbal agreements, suggestions, recommendations, etc
- DAS president will ask the Task Force if they are amenable to splitting the policy
- It was noted that our Tribal partners are used to dealing with other governments and decision makers. They are not used to dealing with Senates/task forces/lage groups. Down the line, we will need to work out, what does consultation look like in terms of NAGPRA compliance? The CSUs and UCs have NAGPRA committees for their whole system. We don't have that yet at this point.
- Request for clarification: the tribal groups had no substantive feedback other than the request to focus solely on NAGPRA compliance?
 - Correct.
- It was noted that the moratorium can not end until the policy is approved. That is why there was so much in the NAGPRA policy.
- Could this be split into policy and regulation? Or, is there interest that it become a policy so that it couldn't be changed as easily as a regulation? (changes to policy require two readings to the board, vs regulations just go through Chancellor's cabinet).
- Opinion that there is a lot of distrust between faculty and admin on this issue.
- Request to bring back to the task force the idea of splitting the draft into policy and regulation
- Sense that there is a "human remains teaching policies" AND a NAGPRA policy embedded within this draft. These are two separate issues/policies
- The draft also deals with past harms/redress/history in Los Rios - the tribes don't see these sections as needing to be part of a NAGPRA policy.
- There was a concern from ARC about the sections about harms being not meaningful enough and not acknowledging ongoing harms. Sense expressed from ARC's senate that we need to be more specific/Los Rios needs to own their participation in holding onto tribal remains & artifacts and be honest about that history.
- Concern that there is a reference to a letter from the Chancellor acknowledging harms, that hasn't been written yet.

3. Refugee pathways

Background:

- Concern from faculty that there was a vocational ESL course advertised in our newsletters for which faculty did not have any input – it was marketed as Refugee pathway ESL.” The course was 26 hours long. It was being called a “training,” but the concerned faculty felt that such an extensive course this goes beyond training. Two local senate presidents brought up this issue with the DO admins, and pointed out that curriculum is a 10+1, and therefore faculty needs to be involved in the process of developing such ESL courses. The District agreed – there was not a good process here. They did not have any information about who wrote the course or how it came to exist. District agrees we need a process for vetting/evaluating these types of classes.

Discussion:

- How do we engage in conversation that this is a 10+1 issue?
- Opinion: In the past, when similar “trainings” have been offered without faculty involvement, the Deputy chancellor has tried to argue that 10+1 doesn’t apply for noncredit training courses. So, their current position is a step in the right direction.
- Could we issue a cease and desist for this ESL course until faculty could review the curriculum?
 - We could. It was noted that the district has a large grant to support refugee pathways.
- Interest in getting more clarification about Strong Workforce/contract ed. Are there issues that intersect with LRCFT?

4. CalMatters

[CalMatters](#) is working on an article about AI-based plagiarism detection software. Los Rios has adopted Turnitin, which incorporates AI. Do we want participate in an interview with CalMatters about this?

Cal Matters may do a CPRA (California Public Records Act) request to gather additional information about Los Rios’ decision to adopt this tool. Would we like to share our reasoning/perspective?

Question: Why did we make the choice to keep using this tool?

- It gives instructors the option of using Turnitin as another data point to use when evaluating student work.
- No instructors are mandated to use the tool, but they have the option to do so if they determine it is appropriate for their course/assignment.
- Turnitin is not an AI detector, it is a similarity report. It doesn’t say “yes this is definitely AI.” But it gives instructors another tool to detect cheating.
- Noted that Turnitin is an evolving tool.

- We felt Los Rios faculty could be trusted to read and consider the information available about the accuracy and appropriate uses of Turnitin.
- We wanted to try it out for a little bit longer and see if it was helpful.
- Noted that there is a recommendation at FLC that if something is flagged by Turnitin, to also consider running it through the ChatGPT detector as well. There is also Grammarly. One problem is that the ChatGPT detector costs money after a certain number of uses.

Does DAS wish the DAS president to participate in the CalMatters report on this topic?

- Question on whether we would have the opportunity to see the questions beforehand?
- Could we do an asynchronous interview?
- Sense that it would be OK to move forward with an interview, especially if we saw the questions in advance.

Question: Does CalMatters have an angle? Are they trying to make us look foolish?

DAS President will ask for the questions in advance.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15.

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Future Returning Items:

-

Upcoming Meetings / Events

-

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