

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, February 17, 2026, 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
- 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
- Eric Wada, Past President

SCC Academic Senate

- Amy Strimling, President
- Ilana Johnson, Vice President
- Lori Petite, Past President

Preliminaries

1. Welcome/Call to order
2. Land Acknowledgement was read
3. Approval of Agenda
 - Request to add noncredit as a discussion item
 - Request to add OGS replacement as an information item
 - Agenda was approved with the above two additions
4. Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests
 - Jason Ralphs, Director of Admissions
 - Harvey Woo, LRPD Police Chief

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

- Speaker wishes to inform the body that on the [2/18/2026 Los Rios Board agenda](#) there is a resolution declaring an Intention to Form a School Facilities Improvement District. Propose to create a subterritory within the Los Rios district. For the purpose of soliciting a facilities bond. Per the resolution, “State law authorizes community college districts to form a sub-territory within their boundaries, each designated as a school facilities improvement district (SFID), and to thereafter call a general obligation bond election within that sub-territory. If the election is successful, voter-approved general obligation bonds may be issued, with the proceeds applied to improve facilities within the SFID.” This proposed sub-territory cuts out El Dorado County, which tends not to vote in support of bond measures. Public hearing expected at the March BOT (Board of Trustees) meeting. The speaker noted that in 2020, the LRCCD put forward a bond measure which failed. A consulting firm had proposed this strategy of reading a SFID. Chancellor King is recommending that Los Rios move forward with a bond measure in November 2026. He will have retired in June 2026. The speaker notes that advancing a bond measure is “one of the riskiest decision a chancellor can make.” Our outgoing chancellor appears to be making this decision about the bond measure for the incoming chancellor. Wanted to share this with the body.
- Public comment given on behalf of an ARC faculty colleague. Wanted to pass along information regarding noncredit. The speaker noted that in the LRCFT contract, there is a difference in workload expectation between teaching credit and noncredit. The typical workload is 60 formula hours for credit faculty vs 90 formula hours for noncredit faculty. There is also a difference in the number of instructional hours that count towards a year of CalSTRS credit. For credit teaching, it is 525 instructional hours. For noncredit it is 875 instructional hours. Concern expressed that the faculty who may be teaching in noncredit need to be aware of this information. Suggestion that this information be forwarded to Belinda Lum for comment/information.
- A speaker noted that there will be a celebration for Officer Linkin (ARC’s canine officer) at ARC on Friday, Feb 20th from 12:30pm - 2:30pm in the community rooms.

7. DAS President’s Report

- Public Safety Advisory Committee Report
- Chancellor’s Meeting Report
- AI Task Force Report
 - Getting ready to sunshine the guidelines. Will share the report broadly with various constituency groups

8. Information Items

- ASCCC Spring Plenary, April 9-11, Hyatt Sonoma Wine Country
 - [Register now!](#)
- LRPD Chief Woo: ICE presence on campus
 - At the request of a senator, DAS President invited Chief Woo to attend DAS and discuss the planned LRPD response if ICE ever comes onto campus.
 - Chief Woo noted that people have been injured or killed while intervening in ICE enforcement, citing examples from Oregon and some portrayed in the media
 - There are discrepancies with state and federal law on these matters, and federal law will prevail. Some local LE agencies have declined to become involved in ICE proceedings and potentially conflict with federal officers. Los Rios PD are required by policy to respond and be present if ICE ever comes onto campus. LRPD officers are trained to deescalate, observe, and will let ICE officers know their body cameras are on. Will let ICE know that if they don't have a criminal warrant, LRPD are not authorized to allow ICE entry. Want to make sure that if ICE officers come onto campus, they are made aware that LRPD officers know the law.
 - Appreciation expressed for how early and proactively LRPD has been engaged with this issue.
 - Concern expressed with potential response by individual LRPD officers. What if an individual officer responds differently than stated Los Rios policy?
 - Chief Woo noted that over 75% of LRPD officers are either immigrants or children of immigrants, and are very empathetic to the problems with how ICE has been handling the public. Noted that current ICE officers are receiving only 8 weeks of training, much of which are about tactics. Previously, ICE/border Patrol officers received nearly a year of training. These new ICE officers don't always understand the law. A lot of them have come from the military and are used to making demands and getting what they want. They are not necessarily trained in deescalation. LRPD officers are trained to deescalate.
 - Chief Woo noted that a lot of times when people are informed that they are being recorded and documented, they do change their behavior.
 - Emphasized that LRPD officers are trained to stay calm and "help keep the temperature down."
 - Question via chat for @Chief Woo: "we have been asked by Los Rios Admin to ask ICE, should they show up in our classroom, to wait while we contact our Local Los Rios PD. What is the response time and how will our officers engage with ICE? What protocols do you have in place other than not working with ICE? How would your presence change the interaction with ICE?"
 - Chief Woo noted that the response time for officers to arrive is a few minutes. LRPD officers are trained to deescalate and to inform ICE officers of the related laws in the situation, such as if they don't have a proper warrant.

- Question about the different types of campus safety officers on campus. How are the community patrol officers trained to respond to ICE, and what would their responsibilities be?
 - Correct, there are a limited number of sworn peace officers - LRPD officers. We typically have 3 police officers per campus that cover the whole day. The campus security officers are meant to be the “eyes and ears” of campus. There are also campus safety officers.
 - Typically it will be the police officers or the police sergeant or captain who would respond if ICE were to come on campus, because they have the most training in the law.
- Question from a senator about administrative warrant vs criminal warrant. Have heard several things that faculty should do if ICE tries to enter our classroom. But based on what has happened in other cities, it seems like no matter what you do, ICE may escalate. What should faculty do if they encounter ICE trying to come into a classroom or workplace?
 - First response should be to say “I am not authorized as a representative of Los Rios and I do not give you consent to enter.” But also, do not physically impede officers. Contact LRPD. Ask to see the officers’ credentials. It is important to document the fact that you are not giving consent, which could be useful in potential future legal proceedings.
- Chief Woo noted that just because you feel you are morally or legally in the right, it doesn’t prevent you from being physically harmed.
- It was noted that there are signs on campus documenting that certain spaces are not public. However, we should not rely on the signs alone.
- Would we initiate campus lockdown procedure if ICE were to come onto campus? Could this lead to ICE escalating the situation?
 - There would be an alert that goes out if we learn ICE is on campus, and it would share the location where ICE is operating. This would be informational. There would not be a lockdown protocol if ICE were on campus.
- Should we keep classroom doors locked in order to bar ICE entry?
 - Unsure how to answer this question. If ICE has a legitimate warrant and you do not allow them to come in, they would breach the door and you could be charged with obstruction of justice, which is a felony under federal law.
- Is there language we should use when ICE comes into a public campus space, such as the library?
 - Unfortunately there is very little we could do about federal authorities entering a public space. If it is a place where the public can generally come in and do business without being impeded, there really is not anything that would prevent federal officers from entering that space. However, LRPD would go and greet them - not to challenge them, but to understand their reasoning for being there and be present to observe.

- Let's say ICE comes into an unlocked classroom, and a faculty member doesn't say anything, out of fear or shock. The faculty member may have wanted to stand up for the students, but didn't know what to say or was afraid. When that faculty member is interviewed later, is this going to be a problem? Would that faculty member get in trouble for not saying anything to ICE?
 - No. By not verbalizing, you are not giving consent. Silence is not consent.
- Online Grading System (OGS) Replacement
 - Our OGS is homegrown and outdated and needs to be replaced. An OGS replacement workgroup will convene to evaluate options and select a replacement tool. This group's structure will be similar to the SOCRATES replacement group. Senate Presidents - please find two faculty from each campus to serve on the OGS group. It could perhaps be the same faculty serving on the SOCRATES group.

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. No report
2. District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) – Paula Cardwell/Lydia Delgado
 - a. No report
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. No report
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Jeff Knorr
5. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
 - a. The February DIAC meeting focused on reviewing the Accessibility Compliance and Maturity Model (ACMM) reports for Los Rios Community College District. The ACMM report addressed the need for district-wide and college-level governance structures to oversee accessibility goals and compliance requirements. The report also recommends renewing UDA coordinator positions to continue the much-needed support in universal design and accessibility work. The group discussed implementing a 30-day free pilot trial of Yuja's accessibility tool, which would require review from the LMS coordinators and the EdTech approval process before potentially expanding to a larger contract. It was also noted that Canvas plans to implement new built-in accessibility tools, which could affect current third-party solutions. Additionally, they discussed the upcoming deadline for digital accessibility under the DOJ Title II ruling, as well as ongoing compliance reviews from the Office of Civil Rights.
6. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue
 - a. No report

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. [Resolution in Support of Honoring Collegial Consultation Relating to Faculty Hiring Processes](#) (Second Reading).

Motion and second to support the resolution

Passed by acclamation

Issue: Resolution in support of honoring collegial consultation relating to faculty hiring processes			
ARC		FLC	
Lopez	yes	Jensen	yes
Slutsky	yes	Lacy	yes
Garvey	yes	Danner	Not present
Shubb	yes	Wada	yes
CRC		SCC	
Wagner	yes	Strimling	yes
Patterson	yes	Johnson	yes
Bond	yes	Kirkpatrick	Not present
Crosier	yes	Petite	yes

2. [Resolution in Support of the Pan-African Virtual College](#) (Second Reading).

Postponed until March 3

3. [R-2231](#): Pause and Notice. Proposal to change section 4.2 (First Reading):

- a. From: Students must petition for reinstatement from dismissal no later than ten (10) working days prior to the new semester by completing a petition form and submitting it to the Vice President of Student Services or designee
- b. To: Students may appeal academic or progress pause on grounds that pause was determined in error, or where remediation of prior notation has improved progress or academic performance such that the student no longer meets the criteria for placement on academic or progress pause for the period being appealed. (5 CCR § 55032)

Background:

- By the time grades get posted, the student often doesn't have 10 days to file the reinstatement petition form. Some campuses report that they don't enforce this 10-day rule because they can't - there simply isn't enough time for students to fulfill the 10 day requirement.
- District Equity and Student Success Committee (DESSC) supports this change.
- Note that this change only strikes the 10 day language, it doesn't add anything new.
- Does this mean there is no time limit? What if they miss a semester or a few semesters?
 - Correct. We want students to come back so the easier we make it for them to do so, the better.
- Where did the original 10 days come from? Was there a historical reason?
 - There is no reason in Title 5 or Ed Code. It would have been a reason internal to Los Rios. But it is not a legal or policy constraint.
- Let's say a formerly incarcerated student returns 10 years later. Is there any negative impact to them from removing the 10 day limit?
 - No.
- Prior to this change, students had up to 10 days to complete the petition form. By removing this 10 day requirement, do they still need to do the petition?
 - Yes they still need to do the petition or at least do the actions that they would be certifying they had done in the petition.
 - So then why is the whole selection of 4.1 struck rather than just the 10 days?
 - It was done for simplicity. There isn't necessarily additional paperwork the student has to file. The college could automate the process of reinstating a student if the student completes all the steps they are supposed to do. This will be tracked by the college
 - Would a student be able to read this section and understand that they can secure reinstatement by submitting a petition?
 - Yes, it is mentioned elsewhere in the regulation.

This issue will go out to the college senates for discussion and come back to DAS for a second read when ready

4. Statement in support of LRCCD Libraries Proposal to District Ed Tech to Change Wi-fi Network Names from:

- a. "Guest" to "Los Rios Guest" or "Los Rios Visitor", and

- b. "LRCCD" to "Los Rios Students-Employees" or "Los Rios Campus Wifi" (First Reading)

Discussion:

- Support expressed for this proposal by the members of DAS, though it was made clear that the members of DAS are only representing themselves as individuals, not their Senate bodies.
- Ed Tech meets Feb 26. There will not be enough time for the senates to all discuss and approve a statement of approval or for there to be two readings at DAS.
- DAS secretary will convey to the Ed Tech faculty co-chair that the individual DAS members support the proposal.
- If the proposal faces objections at Ed Tech, DAS secretary will seek a formal statement of approval from DAS.

Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

No reports

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Questions for General Counsel Aly Bivins re: SB 707 and Brown Act (She will be attending our March 3 meeting). Would the body prefer a brief PowerPoint presentation? Q & A? Both?
 - a. Support expressed for both a presentation and a Q&A.
 - b. Request for a brief presentation with nuts and bolts - many of us have not discussed Brown Act rules with our Senates recently
 - c. Would the District support the academic senates in meeting our Brown Act requirements? Aside from the rules around meeting modalities, there are other requirements with the Brown Act, such as posting minutes. We have been alone in trying to meet a lot of these additional requirements. Request expressed for help and support from the district in meeting our Brown Act obligations.
 - i. Agreement expressed with the previous speaker. We have been put on blast for minor Brown Act infractions, but what support are we getting?
 - d. Are there any updates on the Board Docs workgroup, which is working on selecting a platform for hosting meeting agendas?
 - i. This group has narrowed things down to two vendors, and are seeing presentations this Thursday.
 - ii. Could the information about the search for a Board Docs replacement be shared with our general counsel?
 - e. We know there is no "Brown Act Jail." But if we have committees who are not following the Brown Act rules, is there anything we can do to encourage them to do so?

- i. The danger is that if a group makes a decision and it's not documented, if there is not a quorum present, etc, that decision can be nullified.
- ii. Opinion that refusing to follow the Brown Act undermines the fabric of civil society. We should follow the law even when we wouldn't get "caught" for not following it.

2. Emergency hiring process for coaches: would we consider allowing 1-year terms for emergency-hired coaches?

- a. Background info:
 - i. Adjunct Hiring information in LRCCD regulations: [R-5122](#)
 - ii. LRCCD website: [Hiring Adjunct Faculty](#)
- b. HR reached out to DAS President and explained that they are wondering if, when they hire athletic coaches via an emergency hire process, could they do so on a 1-year basis as opposed to a 1-semester basis? This is because coaching sports doesn't tidily fit into semesters. The coaches are often working outside the normal semester. The athletic season spans a year when you take into account recruiting. Some sports cross semesters. It is terrible continuity for the athletes if the coach changes mid semester.
 - i. Question from senator: Why are we being asked this now? Haven't coaches had this problem for awhile? Is there something else behind this request?
- c. Opinion from LRCFT Chief Negotiator that DAS should require from HR a very clear articulation of the job duties of coaches, the time required to do those tasks, when they need to perform those duties, and what tasks they are paid for. There have been questions in the past on whether recruiting, for example, is a required job duty for athletic coaches. Some coaches have done recruiting work without actually being paid for it because district has said it wasn't "required."
- d. With emergency hires, there is very little process/interviewing involved in hiring them. Risk that we may hire someone who isn't really suited for the job. Opinion that the risk of hiring someone not suitable and being stuck with them for a year is more of a concern than the potential lack of continuity for athletes
 - i. LRCFT Chief Negotiator notes that per ed code all new faculty (including emergency hires) need to do a review in the first semester
- e. Is part of the reason HR is asking for this to reduce the burden on the department to do two interviews?
 - i. Confusion/lack of clarity on whether adjunct faculty hired on an emergency basis need to be re-interviewed before being offered another term of employment.
 - 1. [R-5122](#) section 2.6 states: "Adjuncts hired under this "emergency hire" process may not be rehired for subsequent assignments unless they successfully complete the adjunct interview/hire process described above."
- f. Unclear that it is allowable in ed code to hire an adjunct for two semesters. Perhaps they could hire an LTT.
- g. When would the person be evaluated?
 - i. Sometime in the first semester
 - 1. Would there be logistical issues with trying to evaluate a coach in their first semester if their season wasn't complete?
- h. Risk that if a coach is hired only for 1 semester, they may go find a different job before they are offered the 2nd semester

- i. Couldn't the department just offer the coach the second semester as soon as they've reviewed the person and know they're happy with them?
- j. Opinion that we need clarity on what the review timeline would be for a coach hired on a 1-year emergency hire basis
- k. Does this open the same question for other faculty groups who feel they need 1-year emergency appointments as well? Such as coordinator appointments, faculty with licensure requirements.
 - i. Perhaps, but would this be a bad thing? We do have 1-year LTT positions.
 - 1. Opinion that yes there would be a concern for opening up 1-year terms for all emergency hires - faculty hired into their role as emergency hires have very little oversight.
 - a. Sense from HR that they don't intend to open up 1 year terms for other faculty groups
 - i. But there are course sequences that are 1 year (essentially one course that is split into two semesters), such as in the sciences, so this could become a request from other areas in the future.
 - 2. Reminder that emergency hires would be evaluated in their first semester
- l. Concern that this could be taken advantage of by deans who don't want to do the work to go through the actual hiring process for adjuncts
- m. Request more context for this request. There is a reason why they asked. Opinion that we want more data to understand why they are asking us to make the decision. Worry that there could be more to this request than is being shared.
- n. Opinion that it would be beneficial for DAS to see more data and information on why this request is being made. Lack of clarity around exactly what problem HR is trying to solve
- o. Opinion that we would also like to hear from the athletic departments on what they think of this proposal
- p. We should be aware that when we emergency hire people, those units don't go towards preference. So if we emergency hired someone for a year, that person would have a whole year that didn't count toward preference and rehire rights.

3. Noncredit

- At the discussion on this topic at ARC Senate, it became clear that there are multiple issues that are getting converged:
 - Different number of hours that count toward retirement and workload with noncredit.
 - Concerns from individual departments
 - Concerns around curriculum approval processes for noncredit
 - Questions and unknowns around how certain things would work logistically, such as pay parity
- Interest expressed for disentangling general questions/concerns about noncredit question from the specific concerns of individual departments
- It was noted that state apportionment is the same for enhanced noncredit and credit courses. In terms of faculty pay, the LRCFT union is working out these details, but they believe they have reached agreement with District administration that in terms of credit towards retirement, and workload, our district would treat noncredit the same as credit

during the pilot. There would not be tiers. There would not be a difference in reporting to CalSTRS.

- Comments from LRCFT Chief Negotiator:
 - Confirmation that from LRCFT's perspective, yes, that is the intention of what they want the MOU for noncredit to look like - they intend that during the pilot and going forward, credit and enhanced noncredit will be treated exactly the same for faculty pay/CalSTRS credit/workload. LRCFT will advocate for teaching a 3 unit credit course to be treated the same as teaching a 3 unit enhanced noncredit course.
 - LRCFT Chief Negotiator noted that we are not planning on hiring new people with different minimum qualifications to teach noncredit. We are planning to do this noncredit pilot with our existing faculty.
 - If someone is teaching a full load of noncredit courses, the intention is that it would be reported as 1.0 exactly the same as if someone were teaching a full load of credit courses.
 - We need to understand that the LRCFT contract is a living document. There appear to be outdated/inaccurate references to noncredit in the current contract, and if we need to eliminate those items from the contract that no longer serve us, we will. LRCFT is not sure how the references to noncredit ended up in the contract, since noncredit has never been offered in this district. This language has been there for at least 4-5 contract cycles. We can and will negotiate to change it if that is what we need to do .
 - LRCFT plans to put a reopener clause into the contract language around noncredit stating that the contract can be reopened at the end of each semester to negotiate changes to noncredit language. This way, we can react quickly in case something goes off the rails with noncredit.
- Interest in untangling the recommendations from the noncredit feasibility task force. Concerns expressed around the proposed curriculum approval process. ARC is prepared to support the recommendations from the feasibility task force if they are modified. ARC supports that pilots be conducted in Fall and Spring IF the current curriculum processes can be followed in implementing the pilots (ie, having a first and second reading at separate meetings at the Program Placement Council (PPC)). ARC Senate wants to ensure that the programs receive proper vetting. Concern from ARC Senate about the bullet point about "developing" new processes. ARC has an interest in following our current curriculum processes when it comes to approving noncredit courses. ARC can support amending the recommendation to say something to the effect of, we will follow current curriculum processes and will document aspects that are not applicable to noncredit courses.
 - It was noted that the current PPC process only applies to Career Technical Education (CTE) programs. The goal of PPC is to establish that there is sufficient job market demand in the region to support the program being proposed. So, perhaps we would not send noncredit courses through PPC.
 - Yes, this may be the type of process we need to modify for noncredit.

- We need a PPC “type” process for noncredit to establish that there is a community need for the noncredit courses being proposed.
 - DCCC chair expressed that the interest of the folks who want to pilot for Fall 2026 is to expedite the approval process for these noncredit pilots and NOT take two readings at either PPC or for the new thematic blocks (9000s). Noted that SCC wants to pilot ESL. CRC wants to pilot ESL. FLC wants to pilot BusTec and possibly AI. Opinion expressed that the reason for doing a first and second reading is to let everyone know this is happening. We are doing that now. There will be a motion at DCCC to suspend the rules to do first and second reading at one meeting. Approving the pilots could potentially even be a consent item at PPC. Or, the DCCC chair could potentially call a special meeting of DCCC to approve the pilots in a first and second reading if needed. The interest is to get the pilot course curriculum ready in SOCRATES as soon as possible so we can let counselors know about the courses, and so that the union can negotiate the desired workload, pay, and other aspects of noncredit.
- Additional information from LRCFT Chief Negotiator: Based on an email from ARC’s ESL faculty, they seem to feel that local departments should be able to negotiate parts of the contract. Clarification that this is not possible. Only the LRCFT union can negotiate the contract; individual departments cannot negotiate the contract. Jason Newman has made it clear to the ARC ESL department that noncredit is happening and LRCFT is in support of noncredit moving forward. LRCFT’s main interest is to make sure everyone who teaches noncredit is paid fairly. The union is looking to the Peralta CC district for model noncredit language; they have the strongest contract with noncredit. Their contract states that faculty will be paid the same for noncredit as they are for credit.
 - ([See pg 18.46-47 of Peralta’s contract](#), which states: "CDCP non-credit classes, which are funded by the state at the same level as credit classes, shall have faculty load determined for these classes in the same manner as Page I 18-46 c. with credit classes. For purposes of this MOU, "same manner" includes determining load based on classroom hours in accordance with the provisions of the PFT-District Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); and, professional responsibilities for said classes shall be as specified in the CBA. Faculty assigned to teach the CDCP non-credit classes shall be compensated in accordance with the applicable full-time and part-time faculty salary schedules negotiated by the parties."
- Opinion that at ARC, they are not against noncredit but they want to follow the established curriculum processes.
- Opinion from an ARC faculty member that some faculty at ARC simply do not want noncredit to happen in this district and are using concerns about process as a smokescreen
- Another ARC faculty reminded DAS that the ARC Senate body requested the ARC Senate team to emphasize the 1st and 2nd readings at separate meetings of the curriculum process during the DAS meeting and that this was not the position of a few ARC faculty members.

- Question: Where did this Fall 2026 deadline come from for the pilots to be ready? Why is it necessary to circumvent the normal curriculum process for this artificial deadline?
 - Opinion that nothing is being circumvented. All we are doing is doing first and second readings in the same meeting, which is done frequently.
 - Opinion that the longer we wait to offer noncredit, the more we are depriving our community of access to much-needed courses.
- Senator noted that there is an established curriculum process

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Future Returning Items:

- Recommendation from DCCC to approve changes to P-7141: Instructional Programs/Curriculum Development; change to allow unit increments for 0.25 to be used for some courses. (Second Reading).
- Recommendation from Noncredit Feasibility Task Force (Second Reading):
 - The Los Rios Noncredit Feasibility Task Force met during the Fall 2025 semester to help determine noncredit feasibility from the lens of 10+1 and develop a projected timeline for implementation of this section of work. The task force reviewed statewide documents and resources pertaining to noncredit and had robust discussions about noncredit feasibility.
 - The DAS Noncredit Feasibility Task Force has determined that noncredit is feasible from the lens of 10+1.
 - The DAS Noncredit Feasibility Task Force recommends that
 - noncredit pilots be conducted during Fall 2026 and Spring 2027. The intent of these pilots is to inform future decision making.
 - Local curriculum committees are encouraged to create flexible processes to support these non-precedent setting pilots.
 - the DCCC and local Curriculum Committees develop processes for future approval of noncredit classes and Certificates based on learning from noncredit pilots.
- Not-for-Credit Curriculum Process

Upcoming Meetings / Events

- Feb. 18 AB1705 Math Meeting, 3 pm
- Feb. 18 District Budget Committee Meeting, 3:30 pm
- Feb. 18 Los Rios Board Meeting, Folsom Lake College Community Room, 5:30 pm
- Feb. 20 Program Placement Council, 2:30 pm

- Feb. 20 Convergence Meeting: Animation, 3:00 pm
- Feb. 23 Senate-Union Joint Issues Committee, 2 pm
- Feb. 23 DESSC Meeting, 2:30 pm
- Feb. 23 Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting, 3 pm
- Feb. 25 Socrates Replacement Group Kick-off Meeting 4 pm
- Feb. 26 District Ed Tech Committee, 3 pm
- Feb. 26 District Curriculum Coordinating Committee 2:30 pm
- March 2 District Affordable Learning Materials Committee, 3:30 pm
- March 3 District Academic Senate, 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	