

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, May 6, 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
- Lori Petite, Past President

Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. SCC Land Acknowledgement was read by Ilana Johnson
3. Approval of Agenda
 - Agenda was approved, with a change to the order of items to discuss the English C1000 Placement item first
4. Approval of Minutes
 - [April 15, 2025 DAS Minutes](#) were approved
5. Introduction of guests
 - Aaron Bradford, English co-chair & Curriculum chair, ARC
 - Lisa Sapra, incoming chair, English, FLC
 - Carrie Marks, English chair at SCC
 - Teresa Aldredge
 - LaQuisha Beckum, ARC

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

No public comments

7. DAS President's Report

1. April 24 [Chancellor's Cabinet meeting](#). Items discussed included:
 - a. Updates about the two Los Rios students whose immigration status had been questioned/revoked
 - i. The District has attorneys on retainer for these types of situations, and was successful in reversing the decision in both cases and restoring the students' immigration status
 - b. The legislation proposing for [Woodland Community College to potentially merge with Los Rios](#) (SB 226/Cabaldon) was discussed briefly. It was reported that some folks in the community have spoken against the bill because they are concerned that an outside entity could make these changes unilaterally.
 - c. Brief discussion about next steps for reviving IBA (Interest-Based Approach) training. The discussion was a bit vague on next steps.
2. Plenary Update
 - a. [ASCCC Spring Plenary website](#) (with links to session materials)
 - b. [Adopted resolutions](#) (Spring 2025 forthcoming)
3. May 6 Meeting with VC/AVCs
4. [Chancellor Search](#) Update
 - a. PPL consulting group is hosting listening sessions at all the campuses this week
 - b. Please also contribute feedback via the [online survey](#) by May 9, 2025
 - c. Idea: the Senate(s) could consider writing a statement to share with the search group
 - d. It was noted that at ARC's recent listening session, Los Rios' strong academic senate culture, our unique district academic senate, and our Senates' strong relationship with LRCFT were mentioned as strengths in the district
5. There are resources in the DAS Canvas site for new academic senate presidents

Information Items

1. [Approved Resolutions ASCCC Spring 25 Plenary Session](#)
2. Appointments needed: DESSC AI Workgroup
3. Appointments needed: Hiring Manual Task Force (if approved)
4. Appointments needed: Class Size Task Force

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. Lots of issues discussed at DCCC. Things are going well with CCN.
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – TBA
 - a. Year end recap of things that are happening with fraudulent enrollment. This is an even bigger issue for financial aid - student identities have been stolen, etc. Working hard to make the verification process more secure.
 - b. Lots of hope from DO for the Customer Relationship Management tool (Salesforce). Will it actually prove useful, or will it go the way of the abandoned scheduling tool, Ad Astra? (in other words, cost hundreds of thousands of taxpayer/student tuition dollars in subscription fees and hundreds of hours of staff time/meetings, and never actually be deployed)
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. Focused on faculty concerns related to the Online Grading System (OGS). DOIT is evaluating faculty needs for the new OGS - a survey is forthcoming. Opportunities for faculty to be involved in the process (with compensation) over summer if anyone is interested. Document with a summary of known issues posted in DAS Canvas.
 - b. Question: Are there plans for District to move away from Zoom and start using Teams? Someone has heard a rumor to this effect.
 - i. No, Morgan has not heard this. Zoom is paid for by TechConnect at the state level, not by the district. Teams is used internally by DOIT, but we have both systems. Morgan has heard nothing about Zoom going anywhere.
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Kalinda Jones
 - a. FLC, ARC, and CRC were awarded Rising Scholars network grants, which will run through the next three years.
 - b. At ASCCC Spring Plenary, a resolution was passed related to Rising Scholars.
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

RFP for College Bookstore

- Andi Adkins Pogue (CRC and Chair of DALMC) and Sarah Lehmann (ARC, librarian representative) have been appointed faculty members of the committee, along with DAS president, Paula Cardwell (FLC). There is space for one additional classroom faculty who has experience with the textbook adoption process. The committee agreed to find someone from SCC so all four colleges have representation. Rebecca Goodchild has been tasked with finding someone. The appointment will go through the SCC Academic

Senate president, and Paula is prepared to accept the nomination. Meetings will start fall 2025. Duties:

- Reviewing vendor proposals
- Evaluating CBC's financial analysis of each proposal
- Interviewing shortlisted vendors during presentations
- Recommending the most viable contractor in accordance with the District's procurement process
- A consultant has been hired (Campus Bookstore Consulting Corp.), which will coordinate with VPAs at each college. Any input can be shared directly with your VPA or with DALMC chair, Andi Adkins Pogue
- Note: DALMC will solicit more feedback in the fall..
 - a. The bookstore contract with Follett will be expiring next June. The RFP process will begin in the Fall. Andi Adkins Pogue as well as three other faculty representatives will be serving on the committee. Encourage local discussions at the college senates. Andi will also bring this item to DAS as well. The district has hired a consultant to help with this process.
 - i. Do we know anything about how students will be involved in the RFP process?
 - 1. No, but Andi shares this interest. We could also do surveys as a way to collect feedback from students. Could hold student forums or attend student senate meetings.
 - ii. Do we know who is the consultant? Do we know how much DO is paying?
 - 1. Don't know how much DO is paying, but it is called [Campus Bookstore Consulting Corp.](#) Andi understands that the consultant has already begun visiting the campuses.

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Noncredit Feasibility Relating to Equity & 10+1 - Amended (Second Reading)

Background: [Noncredit Feasibility Task Force Proposal](#)

Discussion:

- Concerns expressed about the whole concept of "Team 1" - about the idea of piloting writing courses in curriculum, because it would be strange for a cross-district team to write curriculum. Also, it feels a bit like putting the cart before the horse because we wouldn't have yet determined that everything is in place, such as the contract changes.
 - Sense that "Team 1" would be doing more of a technical test drive of how SOCRATES supports non credit courses and identify any possible issues.
 - This makes sense, however, the proposal describes writing actual noncredit curriculum

- Note from DCCC chair: SOCRATES is not currently set up to handle noncredit curriculum at all. SOCRATES is based on units, and noncredit is based on hours. That said, there is a draft system ready to go that CAN support noncredit, but the SOCRATES programmer (Phil Smith, ARC math faculty) will not activate it until DAS says they are ready to test it.
- Opinion that writing curriculum for a noncredit course is no different from writing curriculum for any course that doesn't exist yet and still needs to be approved
- Challenge is that Team 1 will be made up of faculty across the district, possibly from multiple disciplines, and should not be the ones to write curriculum.
- Opinion that if faculty want to write noncredit curriculum, let them have at it. But it is not appropriate for Team 1 to do this. It should be an interested department at a college that writes actual curriculum that they want to use.
- Opinion that we don't need to involve SOCRATES yet. The SOCRATES Advisory Group (SAG) can test all the SOCRATES functions and then train the curriculum chairs. The departments can create their curriculum in a google doc for now.
- SCC is ready to start writing noncredit curriculum once DAS gives the go ahead.
- Can we advocate for faculty who opt in to test-write curriculum be compensated for doing this work?
- Do we need to have any conversation about alignment amongst the colleges? The same sorts of alignment issues that came up with English could come up with noncredit.
 - For example, if all colleges except for ARC offered noncredit ESL, how would it impact ARC?
- Program placement council exists to address some of these issues.
- What if we envisioned Team 1 as a data collection & coordination group. They could collect info on what departments are interested. Suggestion: If you have thoughts on what noncredit curriculum would look like, maybe put it into Renee's (forthcoming) template. Then, bring it back to this body for review and analysis.

Issue: Approve the formation of the noncredit task force with the agreed-upon edits as recorded in the proposal document.			
ARC		FLC	
Knirk	n	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	absent
Crosier	y	Petite	y

2. Hiring Manual Task Force (Second Reading)

Background: [LRCCD Hiring Manual Revision Task Force 2025](#)

Discussion:

- Opinion that there should be two faculty from each college
 - Note that it can be difficult to find faculty to appoint to these types of groups
 - Note that sometimes, faculty are appointed but then have to miss meetings, resulting in a lack of representation for a college
- Note that as it is currently constituted, this is not a faculty-weighted committee (5 faculty and 5 admin currently)
 - Interest expressed that the committee be faculty weighted, concern if it is not
- Support expressed for more faculty in the group. Good to have as many lenses as possible in the group. Two faculty from each college helps ensure more perspectives.
 - Opinion that Academic Senate presidents should strive to ensure a diverse group of faculty are represented
 - Opinion that we should try to get at least one counselor in the committee.

Issue: Approve the hiring manual task force proposal, with the change of adding two faculty and invite a rep from LRCFT			
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	Absent
Crosier	y	Petite	y

Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. No reports

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. DAS Retreat Preferences (Wednesday, Aug. 20? Friday, Aug. 29?)
 - a. Group agreed on Friday, August 29, 2025
2. Future of PREP Subcommittee of DAS
 - a. What is the ideal structure for the PREP committee to ensure the committee has a voice? With PREP moving to FLC how should we ensure a faculty voice? DAS makes recommendations to the Board; there is no mechanism for DAS recommendations to go to a College president. Interest in ensuring that PREP is heard. Should PREP remain a subcommittee of DAS?
 - i. This concern is new to the PREP committee chair
 - b. Parts of PREP are still districtwide. What does it mean that PREP is going to FLC?
 - c. Opinion, given the fact that PREP is going to be under a dean who is a district representative, that it is still appropriate for PREP to remain a DAS subcommittee
 - d. It seems like even the admin don't totally know what it means for PREP to be housed at FLC. We have faculty across the district that are teaching in PREP.
 - e. Sense that a DAS PREP committee will have the strongest voice.
 - f. There will still be a need to coordinate across the district to offer viable pathways to students. This is another reason to keep PREP as a DAS subcommittee.
 - g. Also, there will still be a need to make recommendations for the Rising Scholars programs
 - h. Request to agendize this issue in the Fall
3. Chancellor Search Sessions Update
 - a. Chancellor search is ongoing.
4. NAGPRA Policy Update
 - a. Group is meeting tomorrow. They agreed to split the policy as requested by the tribal partners, and this issue will come back to DAS next semester.
5. ENGL C1000 Placement/MMAP Issue

Document: [English Placements Taken Out of Alignment](#) Statement for DAS 5/6/25

 - a. An issue has arisen with English placement across the district.
 - b. Los Rios has had assessment portability across the district since around 2010. If a student assesses into a class at FLC, they would qualify to take the same class at ARC.

- c. Our English and Math depts have collaborated districtwide since AB 705 to discuss appropriate placements. The work is complicated.
- d. For several years, all four colleges have agreed that students coming in with a HS GPA of 2.59 or lower would need to enroll in the ENGL C1000 (formerly ENGWR 300) support course.
- e. Recently, CRC has decided to opt out of that placement. Instead, at CRC ALL students are placed into C1000 and can choose to take the support course if they want to.
- f. Opinion that this decision falls squarely in 10+1 and therefore should have gone through a shared governance-based process to be decided. It should have gone through CRC's English department, be considered by CRC Academic Senate and perhaps CRC Curriculum, etc. It is not clear how this decision was made or who made it. However, it's clear that this decision is a 10+1 issue.
- g. A recent Program Review report from CRC's English department was centered around making this change.
- h. The class schedule went live April 1. CRC's new process was in the most recent schedule.
- i. In late March, English faculty across the district received a questionnaire from their deans about the placement process and where it could be found on the website.
 - i. This information is not on the websites, but the Curriculum chairs would have known how to get the information from the District. Curious that English department chairs were asked what their cut scores were, when the district office has all this information as part of the M-Maps. The information is not published to the students, but the District should know how to find it.
- j. CRC Academic Senate president reported that:
 - i. There was a subcommittee at CRC that recommended this change
 - ii. They had reviewed some data from their college institutional research
 - iii. They got approval from the CRC English department
 - iv. This recommendation then went to the English dean, who took it to the VPI.
 - v. The CRC VPI reported the recommendations to the student learning and instructional support committee, which is not a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. There was discussion at the April 17th SLIS meeting (a discussion item, not an action item.) The VPI reported to CRC Senate President that it was approved at the meeting and adopted, and implemented shortly thereafter.
 - 1. Question: was there a vote on a discussion item?
 - 2. Answer from CRC AS President: to the best of my knowledge, yes, but I am not sure
 - vi. CRC Academic Senate President then got confirmation from the CRC curriculum chair that he did not see anything come through the curriculum committee about this change
 - vii. Question: did CRC reach out to any of the English chairs at the other colleges?
 - 1. Carrie Marks (SCC English) said the CRC English chair and someone from the department committee making the recommendation reached out in March to her to share the idea and ask for input. However, she was unaware that it would be implemented so suddenly without further discussion across the colleges
 - 2. ARC first heard about this on April 24 when they received an email from DO requesting that they convene a meeting to discuss ARC's English placement. It seemed the VPIs were not aware that the district had been aligned on this issue. The timeline and this decision making process was

problematic. Opinion that CRC was given ample opportunity to share their plan with the rest of the district. The district English departments have been engaged in planning a retreat all semester. One of the discussion items was planned for was the co-req class. Yet CRC's new placement process idea was not mentioned while such retreat planning was being done.

3. FLC did not hear about CRC's proposal until April 22 - it was mentioned in passing. Then the April 24 email came out, requesting a meeting with the district English departments. The word "proposal" was used throughout the communication. But by last Monday, it was clear that the proposal was no longer a proposal - it had already been [posted on the website](#). Also had received an email on March 24 from the dean, asking what the placement processes were. Was told the VPI had asked the dean to ask this question because it was not easily findable on the website. Hearing that the decisions were made in March but have only entered a wider forum in the last couple weeks, it seems like things have been done out of order. This impacts the entire district. Making such a drastic change at one college without collegial consultation feels alarming. May impact enrollments at the other colleges. This trickles down to teaching load and schedules. All these things should have been discussed districtwide several months ago.
- viii. Comment that although the district was put in alignment in 2019, it was done in a "sneaky" way and was not a great process. Concerned about this decision being implemented
- ix. Does anyone know when the change to the co-requisite went live on the CRC website?
- x. CRC says they have an interest in adjusting an MMap. This is typically a first step that is done in the collegial consultation process. Rather, this time it is being done as a last step
- xi. CRC removed the requirement for the co-requisite in PeopleSoft in the beginning of April
 1. How do we know that CRC's VPI claimed the change was not made until after the April 17th meeting.
 - a. You can speak to the people at CRC who are involved in setting up the co-requisite requirements in PeopleSoft. April 17 is when students could begin enrolling, so this is accurate.
- xii. Is this an "easier to ask forgiveness than permission" strategy? Hope expressed that DAS will support a demand for CRC to withdraw this implementation. Or if not, that DO guarantees the other colleges won't also be forced to make this change
- xiii. Opinion that they have seen the CRC data, and respect it. But this data, and the co-req models, differ at other colleges. FLC has seen success with their coreq model. FLC has a 2-unit coreq class. Fear that everyone will be dragged into the same coreq model and placement process. The colleges are all doing things a bit differently in ways that work best for them, and want this to be respected.
- xiv. Immediate issue: request from English colleges that there is a request for CRC to undo this change, or seek guarantee that the other colleges will not be forced to do this.

- xv. There is the potential that CRC was operating under the assumption that English placements were already out of alignment. Some at CRC believed that they and they alone had their placements at 2.6 whereas the rest of the district had their placements at 3.0. This has not been true for 5 years, but they may have believed it nonetheless. If they believed it, hope expressed that someone would clarify this. Upon receiving this clarification, hope expressed that CRC would pause/withdraw this action on their own volition, now having learned that they were incorrect about being out of alignment.
- xvi. Curious that English department chairs were asked what their cut scores were, when the district office has all this information as part of the M-Maps. The information is not published to the students, but the District should know how to find it.
- xvii. Will Senate presidents be invited to the meeting with Frank and the English chairs?
 - 1. Opinion that there should be a Senate presence at the meeting.
- xviii. Opinion that this is an egregious violation of faculty purview. Even if it was a group of faculty who wanted to do it, they did not follow any college process to implement this change. It was totally under the radar.
- xix. For clarification: in this case, the onus is on administration to make sure that a recommendation from a department follows the proper process. We respect the faculty who put together this recommendation based on their data. It is the responsibility of administration to make sure the correct process is followed and collegial consultation is followed. Admin should have ensured that the CRC subcommittee brought this recommendation to the CRC curriculum committee in order to follow the collegial consultation process.
- xx. Board policy says that when policies such as this are adopted, administration SHALL consult collegially. It is not just mutual agreement, it is mandated. CRC senate President found out about this only about a week ago. Through conversations with English faculty members, they are very open to having a conversation about this. Seems that they are not trying to force everyone else to make this change. Perhaps there was a misunderstanding about what the process should have been.
- xxi. What would we do about the students who are already enrolled in these classes?
 - 1. Opinion that we do not want to set a precedent of "oh, too late, nothing can be done." Interest in walking back this decision.
 - 2. Possibility that after a certain point, the students who are enrolled may just need to be kept in place.
- xxii. Was CRC planning this schedule all along? How did they create their Fall 2025 schedule without knowing about this change well in advance?
- xxiii. It was noted that there is already a mechanism in place for students to challenge their placement - a placement re-evaluation petition (PREP). They can basically say "I want to take stand-alone ENGWR 300" and the coreq requirement is waived. We could consider that these students have submitted that PREP petition. English is not trying to force students to get more units or take unnecessary coreq courses. We have provided options for students to challenge the placements. No student is forced to be in a coreq course if they don't want to be.

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Future Returning Items:

- Baccalaureate Degree Exploration/Feasibility
- Proposal to amend District Academic Senate by-laws: Article 11, Section 2
- Not-for-Credit Curriculum Process
- Districtwide Convocation Proposal

Upcoming Meetings / Events

- May 16, PPC, 2:30 pm
- May 14, Board Meeting, 5:30 pm
- May 16, Tenure Reception 3:00 District Office Courtyard
- May 20, DAS, 3:00-5:00 (tentative)

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	