



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 16, 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
- Sarah Lehmann, Secretary

ARC Academic Senate

- Veronica Lopez, President
- Daniel Slutsky, Vice President
- 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
- Lori Petite, Past President

Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. FLC Land Acknowledgement was read by Wayne Jensen
3. Approval of Agenda
 - Agenda was approved
4. Approval of Minutes
 - 12-2-2025 minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests
 - Craig Davis

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

-

7. DAS President's Report

- NAGPRA update

- Had official consultation with tribal partners. There was great feedback from the tribal partners. They have experience from working with the CSUs.
- Group is incorporating feedback and will be bringing back to DAS in future.
- Public Safety Advisory Committee Update
 - Met last week.
 - Discussed the most recent Clery report.
 - Reviewed the recent CRC incident with Elk Grove Police.
 - Suspect was being sought off campus - drove vehicle onto campus and crashed it - took off on foot
 - Use of drone to identify suspect, who was hiding in the bed of a truck.
 - Concern raised about athletes/coaches who do not have their phones to receive the alerts.
 - Issues with the buildings being immediately locked, then people coming down to let students into the locked buildings. In a lockdown, we are not supposed to let people into the locked buildings, even if we believe they are students.
 - Learned more about Officer Lincoln the emotional support dog (aka Officer Fluffy Paws). Officer Lincoln is able to identify people who are in emotional distress and is trained to get closer to the person to see how they react and offer emotional support.

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. All 4 English departments have decided to take ENGWR courses and convert to ENGL to match CCN. Expected for fall 2026.
 - b. Pilot for non credit for fall 2026. DCCC has a process in place and local curriculum committees will see requests through the process in spring.
 - c. Credit for Prior learning needs some coordination across the district.
 - d. Watch for flex sessions related to CCN.
 - e. Question about state funding available to support Credit for Prior learning. Has the DCCC heard about this? How are the Senates providing input in how these resources are being used at the college?
 - i. CRC asked for clarification of the process that is being worked out for Credit for Prior Learning.
 - ii. CRC also reported situations where students enrolled in CCN classes that they had already completed under the different numbering (think the class was PSYC 300). Alisa will look into this, it is a PeopleSoft issue.

2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – Paula Cardwell/Lydia Delgado
 - a. SUJIC affirmed the resolution related to Academic Probation Language.
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. Early next semester we will have multiple AI-based LTI (Canvas add-ons) coming before EdTech to be added to the consent-agenda for District Academic Senate
 - b. Also coming up - beginning the work to assess for a SOCRATES replacement
 - c. We are still awaiting the VPAT from Google for their Gemini LTI.
 - d. The other LTI we will be looking at:
 - MathGPT
 - Similar to other textbook tools that have homework built in.
 - Request from FLC to be added
 - Nectir AI
 - Statewide partnership tool
 - Stuck in process at District
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Jeff Knorr
 - a. The PREP committee continues to meet on the first and third Thursday of the month. We are continuing to:
 - i. Refine the PREPC charge and mission statement;
 - ii. Discuss the scheduling and recruitment of faculty for in-facility classes at Mule Creek and FSP
 - iii. Discuss equity in student and staff hiring in LRCCD and the incongruence with the Hiring Policy Guidelines from the CCCCCO.
5. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
 - a. No report
6. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
 - a. No report

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. [Resolution in Support of Reducing and Clarifying Los Rios Counselor-to-Student Ratio](#). (second reading)
 - a. Some edits for the second read include an additional resolved statement and a recommendation to update regulation R2511

- b. Input received that the proposed ratio is so much lower than the existing ratio that it seems too ambitious. Is there any interest in revisiting the proposed ratio, or removing the specific ratio numbers?
 - i. Support expressed for keeping the 1:370 number and aligning with the ASCCC recommendation that this number came from. Confidence expressed that LRCFT will negotiate the best ratio they can.
 - ii. Overall support from ARC for keeping the number
- c. Concern expressed from ARC counselors about the ratio being linked to the number of counseling hours. ARC counselors have asked to split the resolved statements, and they can support the 1st and 3rd resolved statements, but not the 2nd one which is related to basing the ratio on counselor hours. Feedback from ARC counseling faculty member: “Mentioning hours can lead to unintended consequences, such as losing the opportunity to serve on committees or college service, in an effort to see more students. Preference is on the ratio being tied to the number of counselors (see CRC’s caveat of the 75% ratio of FT to adjunct). However number of counselors is also concerning because some counselors have reassigned time and are not 1.0 fte counseling.”
 - i. If we remove the second resolved, would like to discuss how to address the issue of reassigned counselors being included in the ratio.
- d. Suggestion that there be a follow-up request to rename the “Counseling Entitlement Report” to “Counselor Workforce Report”
- e. How might this resolution impact the “50% law?”
 - i. Opinion that this is a recommendation to our Board, and it is very possible the board will say something to the effect of “thank you very much for this recommendation, but unfortunately due to fiscal reasons we cannot accept it.” However, opinion that the overall goal of this recommendation is to make the Board aware of the intense need for more counselors. To enroll students and then deny them the counseling support they need to succeed is a waste of resources. Want the board to know that we as faculty recognize and support hiring more counselors. Sense the message that our students are being underserved. Push back against the 900:1 “floor” where we are not “allowed” to hire more counselors unless we are at the floor. Also want our union to have this resolution to be able to take into negotiations.
 - ii. It is a stretch goal to hopefully be implemented over time, not all at once

Vote 1:

Issue: Remove second resolved relating to basing the ratio on counselor hours			
ARC		FLC	
Lopez	y	Jensen	y

Slutsky	y	Lacy	y
Garvey	absent	Danner	y
Shubb	y	Wada	y
CRC		SCC	
Wagner	y	Strimling	y
Patterson	y	Johnson	absent
Bond	y	Kirkpatrick	absent
Crosier	y	Petite	y

Vote 2:

Issue: Approve perfected resolution
This motion was approved by acclamation

2. Academic Probation Language Task Force: Proposed changes to the following policies and regulations upon recommendations from DESSC (and to maintain compliance with impending changes to Title 5). (first reading)
 - a. [P-2231](#) – Academic Standards (Updates “Probation” to “Notice” and “Dismissal” to “Pause”)
 - b. [P-7252](#) – Grading Practices and Standards (Updates “Probation” to “Notice” and “Dismissal” to “Pause”)
 - c. [R-2211](#) – Admission and Entrance Requirements (Updates “Probation” to “Notice” and “Dismissal” to “Pause”)
 - d. [R-2231](#) – Academic Standards (Updates “Probation” to “Notice” and “Dismissal” to “Pause”; simplifies title 5 language for readability and implementation, clarifies appeal and return to good standing processes).
 - e. [R-2511](#) – Counseling Services (Updates “Probation” to “Notice”)
 - f. [R-7252](#) – Grading Practices and Standards (Updates “Probation” to “Notice” and “Dismissal” to “Pause”; further clarifies repetition after academic renewal)

Discussion:

This will come back for second read in February

Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. No reports

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Processes/Resolution to remove dean's ranking from hiring process

- a. Faculty hiring is a 10+1 issue. This is our wheelhouse. Sense that there has been encroachment by admin into this area of faculty purview. What should we do to address this issue?
- b. What are the processes for faculty hiring prioritization at the four colleges?
 - i. At SCC, the Academic Senate President sits in on the final meeting between the executive cabinet and determines the final ranking based on Senate ranking and Deans ranking. SCC does not do hiring presentations; instead, department chairs submit a justification based upon agreed upon criteria and a rubric is used to guide ranking. They review their hiring process each spring and agree upon changes/improvements based on what worked and didn't work the previous time.
 - ii. At FLC, faculty do their own faculty hiring prioritization process and ranking. The deans create their own ranked list. Representatives from different areas meet with their faculty colleagues and their dean to provide input. Then the President makes the final decision, and it is not clear how that decision is made or if faculty input is "relied primarily upon."
 - iii. At CRC, all the departments who want to put in for a faculty hire do so. Then each division does an internal ranking of all the positions from their area. These get compiled and put together in a file as well as hard copy booklets. Everyone who is part of the hiring prioritization process gets the electronic file of all the requests and can request hard copies. Admin and faculty meet to hear presentations at the same time, together in a room. Everyone who is in the room for those presentations then ranks individually, and one list is formed based on those rankings. There are not separate lists for different constituency groups. The ONE ranked list goes to the president. The Academic Senate President meets with the president to review the list. The college president makes the final decision on hiring prioritization. If there are any deviations from the list, the

president sends a memo to explain why. CRC is fairly happy with their process and supports the other colleges in improving theirs.

- iv. At ARC, department chairs submit a packet of information about the positions they want to request for hiring. Then, department chairs give presentations to the Academic Senate explaining why their positions are needed. Academic Senators then rank the positions in order of priority. The Senate ranking document is then shared publicly. Separately, deans create their own ranking list. Deans are not required to attend the faculty hiring presentations, though some do. The deans are invited to review the recorded video of the presentations. The deans' ranking list is not public and is seen only by the president's executive team. The President makes the final determination on what positions to hire. This year, the Senate asked the college president to share her rationale on where she deviated from the faculty recommendations. For example, the ARC faculty ranked a chemistry position as #4 priority out of 40+ positions, but Chemistry was not given a position by the college president. ARC President shared a rationale for the positions the ARC President ranked highest, but not a rationale for why her list deviated from the Senate list; Positions that were in the Academic Senate ranking list but not in the President's list were not discussed in the rationale provided by the ARC President Memo.
- c. Clarification sought about what it means for administration and faculty to "mutually agree upon" faculty hiring decisions
 - i. Question: do we mean the process of hiring faculty, or the final list of positions that are hired? Isn't it all a recommendation to the college president?
- d. Faculty at colleges where there is a faculty-generated ranked list have no certainty that the faculty input is taken into account when making the final decisions.
- e. LRCCD general counsel ruled that individual faculty members' rankings of the faculty hiring positions needed to be public because they are votes.
- f. Questions about how the numbers of faculty hires are allocated and determined each year, and furthermore, how those positions are divided amongst the colleges.
- g. Suggestion to create an ad-hoc task force to work on promoting transparency and clarifying faculty rights in terms of faculty hiring prioritization processes
 - i. CRC suggests inviting ASCCC to talk with us first, then considering whether the ad-hoc committee is still needed
 - 1. Consensus that it is a good idea to invite ASCCC to talk with us. In particular, there are inconsistencies between Regulation 5121 and the faculty hiring manual. Opinion that we need to look into these inconsistencies and reconcile/clarify them.
- h. Should we invite a team from ASCCC to talk with our district leadership about the law regarding faculty hiring?
 - i. Support expressed for this idea

- ii. DAS President will reach out to ASCCC to ask for support

2. Waiving GE for students who have earned an AA/AS degree in Los Rios

- a. There has long been an understanding that if you already have a bachelor's degree and you come to a community college for an additional degree or training, you can get the degree or certificate without taking the GE.
- b. Question about whether that is also true for people who have an associate's degree.
 - i. LRCCD general counsel researched it and found that there is nothing that says we CAN'T allow that. It is our discretion as a district if we wish to waive the GE requirements for individuals with an AA/AS degree.
 - ii. Los Rios articulation officers are in support of allowing this
 - iii. This will come through DAS at some point
 - iv. It was pointed out that we have a new GE requirement in ethnic studies - should everyone be required to take that class even if they already have a degree?
 - v. Please bring this to your Senates and get a sense of people's opinions on this issue. Please talk with your articulation officers as well.
 - vi. Someone asked about whether there is a rule that if it's been 10 years since someone got a degree, they have to retake the GE
 - 1. Consensus that this no, this is not true, it is an urban legend.
There is no recency requirement for waiving GE
 - vii. Background: typically when a new student comes in and they have an AA degree from somewhere else, we look at how their GE courses they've taken compare to our requirements in Los Rios, and ask the students to take classes that we require locally that we may not have taken
 - viii. Note: we are just talking about local degrees here

3. District Support of AI Training

- a. Deputy Chancellor says that if DAS is interested in faculty training for AI, district will support it financially. Offering districtwide AI training does not preclude or supersede local trainings; each college can offer whatever AI trainings it wants.
- b. Recommendation that there be a clearinghouse for college-specific trainings, so that all Los Rios faculty are aware of trainings at all the colleges
- c. What would be the focus of the AI training?
 - i. Sense that it would be driven by the faculty and could focus on whatever we wanted.
 - 1. Suggestion: basic pedagogy and UDL training for the AI context

- d. Question about what tools faculty have available to detect misuse of AI. It is causing our faculty a lot of extra work to try and detect AI and deal with it with their students. Goal to help faculty work through that.
 - i. Perspective: you cannot “out-AI AI” but you can adjust your teaching to avoid the easiest student misuse of AI
- e. Please bring this to your Senates and gather input, opinions, and gauge interest. What AI-related trainings do we most need?

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- At ARC, there is some confusion around regulation 5121 regarding faculty hiring committees. Who gets to appoint who to committees? What is in that regulation does not 100% align with our faculty hiring manual. This is causing some confusion and challenges at ARC.
- At SCC, dealing with major issues related to FTE cuts. There were spring cuts that started the week before Thanksgiving (for scheduled Spring 2026 courses with students already enrolled). Were told it was due to one-time allocations from Spring 2025 that they thought would roll over but did not. Dealing with additional cuts now, and there is not clear messaging surrounding the cuts. Trying to get to the bottom of whatever is happening.
 - Are courses being cut according to faculty preference, and taking into account full-time faculty load? Or are they just cutting low enrolled classes and making department chairs juggle things around.
 - A mix of both
 - This has been done without department chair consultation – department chairs just have to clean up the mess
 - Opinion that it should NOT be the department chairs that call the adjuncts to tell them their class is cut. This is admin’s job. Faculty should not have to call their peers and tell them they are losing their jobs. The Union has made it clear this is not a faculty responsibility.

Future Returning Items:

- [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](#)
- Not-for-Credit Curriculum Process

Upcoming Meetings / Events

- Dec. 17: AB 1705 Math Meeting, 3 pm
- Dec. 17: Board of Trustees Meeting, 5:30 pm, Board Room
- Dec. 19: Program Placement Council meeting, 2:30 pm
- Jan. 14: Board of Trustees Meeting, 5:30 pm, Board Room
- Jan. 20: DAS Meeting/Retreat, 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	