



DAS President Paula Cardwell

ARC President Veronica Lopez

CRC President Lauren Wagner

FLC President Wayne Jensen

SCC President Amy Strimling

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, December 2, 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

- Veronica Lopez, President
- Daniel Slutsky, Vice President
- Andréa Pantoja Garvey, Secretary
- Alisa Shubb, Past President

CRC Academic Senate

- Lauren Wagner, President
- Jason Patterson, Vice President
- Emily Bond, Secretary
- Scott Crosier, Past President

FLC Academic Senate

- Wayne Jensen, President
- David Lacy, Vice President
- Lisa Danner, Secretary
- Eric Wada, Past President

SCC Academic Senate

- Amy Strimling, President
- Ilana Johnson, Vice President
- Nadine Kirkpatrick, Secretary
- Lori Petite, Past President

Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. CRC Land Acknowledgement was read
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

1. IBA/IEPI Update

- a. The final meeting with the [IEPI](#) (Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative) team occurred. Los Rios will receive the \$200,000 to reboot the Interest-Based Approach trainings, which have not been held in several years. Previously IBA was a 3-day training held in a hotel. New goal of making the trainings more accessible to more employee groups- it can be tough for a faculty member to leave their class for 3 days, even with subs. Eager to establish a renewed focus on dialogue and community building with the new Chancellor coming on.
 - i. Interest in making the IBA process more culturally aware and acknowledge different communication styles. Opinion that the previous IBA processed centered a White/Eurocentric communication style

2. Chancellor Search/Forums Update

- a. Impressions for finalists will be held December 8, 2025 from 9am - 12pm. Sense from faculty that Monday morning is not an ideal time for impressions. DAS President emailed the Board with this feedback and President Wilkerson tried to move the impressions to a different day, but it was not possible.

3. VC/AVC Meeting Recap

- a. Clarified Type C banking. Commitment to create a transparent way to track the amount of Type C leave people have. Essentially, it is 6 courses for 5
- b. Noncredit. The district would like to bring in a consultant to help us with the noncredit pilot. There is a person they have in mind (an administrator from Mt. San Antonio College) to help create the structure at the district level
- c. AI training. District has said they are supportive if DAS wants to recommend a districtwide AI training for faculty, similar to the Foundations of Canvas course. Please discuss at your college whether this is of interest. Another option would be for the colleges to create their own AI trainings. Individual colleges could do their own trainings even if they were a districtwide training.
- d. We need a new curriculum management system. A SOCRATES replacement advisory group is kicking off. SOCRATES is built on a very old programming language called PERL that no one learns anymore. If there is anyone at your colleges with an interest in serving on this SOCRATES replacement advisory group, please forward their name to DAS President. Please identify 2-3 faculty from each college who would be willing to serve
- e. CCN update. There will be a FLEX workshop on Wednesday January 14 to speak with folks who will be going through the Phase III process.
 - i. After CCN, courses will not be able to be cross-listed. This will create issues with FTE and preference. DAS and the Union will work with District to solve those issues.
- f. Variable units with positive attendance accounting. We will go down to .25 in reporting positive attendance. This will primarily affect courses with very specific hour requirements related to certification.
- g. If someone comes to Los Rios who already has a bachelor's degree, we waive all GE requirements. There is now a proposal that we also waive GE requirements for students

who already have Associates degrees. Our legal department has said this is permissible. Some questions to consider:

- i. Should there be a date cutoff, for example the degree must have been received in the last 10 years?

4. Collegial Consultation Report: Fall 2025

- a. [Link to the report](#). Sense that robust and respectful consultation is happening in many areas
- b. One exception is the Accessibility Capability Maturity Model process. The process has been faculty initiated and faculty led, but key aspects such as inviting stakeholders for meetings were supposed to be done by admin. However, they got the information out too late and there was the sense that the kickoff meetings were not as successful as they could have been had there been more advanced notice and time to inform stakeholders about the meeting.
- c. Another exception is the English department issue with GPA cutoffs from last semester (see [DAS minutes from May 6, 2025](#)). CRC English faculty proposed allowing students to choose whether to take English with support or without support. Typically this type of decision would go through a districtwide curriculum process, but in this case the change was implemented without the usual process- someone at CRC was perhaps unaware of the typical process and just took the idea and implemented it. DAS was able to stop and reversing the change successfully and professionally.
 - i. Now that there is an English AB 1705 group that is meeting. Concern that these 1705 groups could be inadvertently making 10+1 changes without proper collegial consultation with DAS
- d. Opinion that the Chancellor search process has not been a good example of collegial consultation. Concern about the tight timeline for feedback after the candidate forums.
- e. Please provide input on this report if desired

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. At the next meeting, they will start updating the regulation to allow for the awarding of quarter units (in certain cases)
 - b. Will discuss noncredit
 - c. Will discuss discontinuing the practice of cross listing courses
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – Paula Cardwell/Lydia Delgado
 - a. Not much to update since last report. The AI task force is meeting Friday and they are hoping to complete their draft AI guidelines to bring back to DAS

3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. No update
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Jeff Knorr
 - a. No update
5. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
 - a. No update
6. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
 - a. Members were surveyed about a potential restructuring. The majority of respondents indicated they would like to continue holding monthly meetings, but also supported revising the committee charter to require that local committee chairs serve on the district committee or appoint a faculty designee.
 - b. Under this proposed structure, local committees may choose to schedule their meetings on the same day as DALMC, with timing that allows the local meeting to follow the district-wide meeting. This would give colleges the flexibility either to consolidate meetings into a single day or to maintain their existing meeting schedule. Members will discuss and recommend new language for the charter in the spring 26 semester.

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. ACMM Recommendations

- a. Postponed, the recommendations have not come in yet
- b. Concern about the vibe during the kickoff meetings. Sense that it was very dismissive and the [facilitators](#) had the mentality of “we already know the answers because we already talked to District.”
 - i. This attitude did not make a positive impression with faculty
 - ii. Sense that we were being told “you’re busted, you’re doing a bunch of things wrong.”
 - iii. Facilitator asked about how textbooks are selected, and when told the answer, the facilitator said something like “oh so we’re just ignoring the law then?”
 - iv. Vibe felt defeating, like we were going to get a list of things we’re doing wrong
 - v. Concerns about how well this process is going to go with faculty given how poorly the kickoff sessions went
 - vi. Sense that the folks who need to hear this are administrators - they control the money. Thought that the goal of the process was to make it clear to administrators that we have a lot of aspects to improve when it comes to accessibility
 - vii. Faculty are not accessibility specialists. They are experts in their discipline. Opinion that the District is responsible for making sure materials are accessible

- viii. Sense that the facilitator did not take an inventory of the trainings that the colleges had offered.
- ix. During the kickoff presentation, the verbal message was “this is an everyone project” but the slides only listed things faculty should be doing
- x. Sense that more administrators should have been in the room, and should have been invited earlier.
- xi. Reminder that DAS recommended the ACMM process to the District. We want our leaders to understand their responsibilities. Wish that more of our leaders had been in the room during the ACMM meetings.
- xii. Opinion that the rollout was confusing. Would have benefited from more collegial consultation/dialogue and planning around the rollout
- xiii. The ACMM folks provided the information to the District, but the District didn’t share it with the colleges in a timely manner.
- xiv. Should ACMM be listed as “not effective” collegial consultation in the Fall 2025 Collegial Consultation report?

2. Socrates Replacement Workgroup

- a. Need appointments from each college to serve on this group.

3. CRC Academic Integrity Committee Concerns

- a. CRC’s Academic Integrity Committee brought concerns to CRC Academic Senate last year. The senate voted to change the process for what happens when a faculty refers a student for discipline due to cheating.
 - i. The Academic Integrity Committee created a formal statement that would go out to faculty that academic integrity is important, they should look for it in their class, and they should follow the process when cheating is suspected
 - ii. They also made a request to admin for data to be shared with CRC Senate about the number of cases referred and their resolution
 - iii. Proposed some changes to the form that faculty fill out to report suspected academic integrity violations
 - iv. This committee also made a request for admin to close the loop, and that faculty will get a response confirming receipt of the form
 - v. Also, this group requested that admin report back to faculty on the outcome of what happened in the meeting between the student and the conduct officer. Administrators checked with legal and said no, this is a FERPA violation and they could not tell the faculty what happened in the meeting.
 - 1. CRC faculty currently get a notice saying the process is concluded. They do not get told the outcome. The student does get a written summary of what happened and could take that document back to the professor to show they were found to have not cheated.
- b. CRC Academic Integrity Committee then came back to CRC Academic Senate this semester with another request. There is only one administrator in charge of this process, and there are no faculty involved. The committee would like a panel of faculty to be involved in the process. CRC VPSS shared the Board regulation ([Los Rios Regulation 2442.1.1](#)) on why that can’t be done - the regulation states the College Disciplinary officers will be administrative staff. CRC’s Academic Integrity Committee would like to propose this regulation be changed.

- i. Is any other college interested in changing this regulation so that instructional faculty could be involved in reviewing academic integrity cases?
 1. Opinion/experience expressed that usually, administrators will backup faculty in grade change request cases, as long as the syllabus is clear.
 - a. Opinion that this isn't always the case.
- ii. Sense that at CRC, there are faculty who believe that students are getting away with academic dishonesty. They want to know that there is enforcement happening.
- iii. Opinion that from the faculty perspective, the resolution should be the student receiving a 0 in the gradebook. What is the further goal being sought?
 1. The faculty want to know the outcome of the conduct officer's review process. For example, if the faculty member made a mistake and the student actually didn't cheat, the faculty would like the opportunity to resolve the mistake without the student having to go through a formal grievance process.
 - a. But wouldn't the student come back and tell the faculty if a mistake was made?
 - i. Unclear in what cases the faculty member would not already be informed of the outcome by the student if a mistake were found to have been made
- iv. Sense that the college processes are different. For example, at SCC if a faculty member suspects cheating, the first step is a meeting with the faculty, the student, and the dean. Then if that meeting can't resolve the issue, it is referred to the student conduct officer. Given the different processes, it is unclear what DAS is being asked to support
 1. Sense from CRC that there is a lack of trust in the integrity of the process. Sense that it would be ideal if faculty were involved in the process
- v. Suggestion that CRC's Academic Integrity Committee drafts an academic integrity process that they propose be followed.
- vi. Sense that the regulation admin cited covers student *conduct*, not just academic integrity. Opinion that we actually do not have any policies governing how we handle academic integrity at Los Rios. We are operating in a sort of void when it comes to academic integrity. Other colleges do have more clear policies. Using the discipline process for academic integrity doesn't really make sense.
- vii. Opinion that compiling evidence to show a students' academic dishonesty is much harder with AI.
- viii. Concern that if faculty start to second guess the decisions of the conduct officers, it invites conduct officers/admin to second guess the decisions of faculty
- ix. Opinion that we want to be student centered.
- x. Hesitation expressed about changing the regulation, which broadly covers student behavior and conduct, not just academic integrity. There are very private things being discussed in those conduct meetings. Opinion that we should rely upon the student to come back to the faculty with the decision of the conduct officer if they disagree. The student also has the option of initiating a formal grievance process, which then involves a faculty panel.
- xi. The conduct officers are required to follow strict timelines and keep careful records of all the cases they review.

- xii. Opinion that the distrust of the process is not fair; the process has integrity and there are avenues open to the student to appeal or grieve if they disagree with the outcome.
 - xiii. Recommendation from DAS that the CRC Academic Integrity Committee draft some specific language that they would like DAS to consider
- 4. Is it possible to get better data regarding the reasons students drop courses?
 - a. There is a movement afoot at CRC to use student success data in faculty evaluations
 - i. Opinion that student success data tells us nothing without context.
 - ii. Evaluating faculty based on student success creates a perverse incentive to try and only teach students who are most likely to succeed OR to engage in rampant grade inflation.
 - iii. Impression that CRC admin are saying “we understand that the reason students drop is out of your control” but also “Ok faculty how are you going to fix it??”
 - iv. Opinion: some faculty and departments do appreciate seeing the success data and using it to understand why there are achievement gaps
 - v. Opinion: It would be nice to know more about why students drop
 - vi. Opinion: the data on why students drop is fraught. It is none of our business. Our students lives are complicated and there could be lots of reasons why they drop or are not successful in their classes that they do not want to tell us about. Opinion that the fact that we have an overall success rate of 70% is impressive and to be applauded. Faculty are working magic every day
 - vii. Question: is the CRC decision to use student success data in evaluations being used as a trojan horse to get this practice into all the colleges?
 - 1. Sense that presidents are waiting and seeing how it goes. Our Union is fighting it and has
 - 2. Opinion: Ed Bush could be stopped by the Chancellor. Yet the Chancellor has not stopped it, and has allowed the PERB charge to go through rather than stop it. This is not just a CRC issue, it is an issue for all colleges.
 - b. CRC would like to know more about why students drop
 - c. The CRC researchers will be giving a presentation on what data is currently gathered and what students are currently asked when they drop classes

5. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Processes

- a. Postponed

6. Next District Academic Senate President

- a. We need to begin discussing this. There has been a DAS interest expressed in better transitions. It is SCC’s turn in the rotation. SCC will discuss and will get back to DAS in January.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08pm

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Future Returning Items:

- [Resolution in Support of Reducing and Clarifying Los Rios Counselor-to-Student Ratio.](#)
- [Proposed amendment to R-2222](#) (Attendance Requirements and Reports) to define 'no-shows' for asynchronous online classes; to distinguish between No Shows and Application of Census drops; and to define excessive absences..
- [Resolution in support of the Pan-African Virtual College](#)
- Academic Probation Language Change Proposal
- Not-for-Credit Curriculum Process

Upcoming Meetings / Events

- Dec. 4: PREP Subcommittee, 9 am
- Dec. 5: DCCC, 2:30 pm
- Dec. 8: Chancellor Finalist Forums, 9-12 Board Room
- Dec. 8: Public Safety Advisory Committee, 3 pm, DO Conference Room
- Dec. 10: AB 1705 English Meeting, 10 am
- Dec. 15: DESSC Meeting, 2:30 pm
- Dec. 15: Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting, 3 pm, Board Room
- Dec. 17: AB 1705 Math Meeting, 3 pm
- Dec. 17: Board of Trustees Meeting, 5:30 pm, Board Room
- Jan. 14: Board of Trustees Meeting, 5:30 pm, Board Room
- Jan. 20: DAS Meeting, 3-5 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	
Lopez		Jensen	
Slutsky		Lacy	
Garvey		Danner	
Shubb		Wada	
CRC		SCC	
Wagner		Strimling	
Patterson		Johnson	
Bond		Kirkpatrick	
Crosier		Petite	