

District Academic Senate (DAS) Minutes

Tuesday, 21, 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
- 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. Land Acknowledgement was read
3. Approval of Agenda
 - CRC would like to have a brief discussion about the following topics:
 - R-2222
 - AI guidelines
 - SCC requests time for an a discussion about DAS leadership at the end of the meeting
 - Agenda was approved as amended
4. Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes were approved
5. Introduction of guests

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

- A faculty member shared two concerns:
 - First, about the practices in their college's counseling office. This faculty member has observed that students are being told that they must take 15 units, as if there aren't any other options for part-time. Pushing students towards full time schedules doesn't take into account their individual needs, life circumstances, their support system, and their previous experiences with the education system. Opinion expressed that part time is a better option for some students, but the counselors seem to direct students away from resources such as the part time program sample maps, even though our college and programs have part-time maps available for students. .
 - Second concern - this faculty member's department is hiring a full time colleague. They have noticed that their hiring pool has been reduced by 80% due to applicants not meeting minimum qualifications for technical reasons, such as an applicant who actively teaches in the district not realizing they need to check a box to say they meet minimum qualifications. Request made for the opportunity for department/content-experts to review the process for evaluating minimum qualifications.
- James Crandall, the district's NAGPRA Director, would like to note some additional background info about NAGPRA. State law requires that the UC and CSU campuses develop NAGPRA policies in consultations with their local Native tribes. Community colleges are not required to do this, but Los Rios chose to engage with local tribes anyway. During our NAGPRA policy development process, eight local tribes provided us with feedback and comments. Ours is the first community college NAGPRA policy developed in conjunction with tribes. Thanks extended to the tribes that collaborated with Los Rios on this policy. Thank you also for the hard work of the group that worked on this policy. Thank you to District administrators for supporting the work.

7. DAS President's Report

The usual monthly meeting with the chancellor did not occur this month. But the DAS President and the four college presidents did meet with some of the District VPs and learned more about the [bond measure that Los Rios is considering](#) putting forward on the November 2026 ballot. The funding from this bond measure would fund the top 2 infrastructure projects at each campus. Sense that the messaging around this bond makes it seem like the District is in dire financial straits. The board will need to make the decision in July on whether this bond measure will go on the ballot in November. The district is conducting polls to gauge the public's appetite for passing this measure.

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) – Lydia Delgado
 - a. Yesterday was DESSC's final meeting for the semester. They reviewed the work they've done this past year, including AI task force guidelines, GE waiver, and Academic Dismissal/Notice & Pause language changes.
 - b. Transcript consolidation process in progress at Los Rios so that students can get all their grades from one transcript
 - c. Have heard presentations from the Basic Needs programs at the campuses
 - d. Have heard presentations from the Academic Pause & Dismissal programs at the campuses
3. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) – Morgan Murphy
 - a. No report
4. Prison & Reentry Education Program Committee (PREP) – Jeff Knorr
 - a. The LRCFT union is suspending the MOU at Mule Creek for the in facility program. Many issues were happening at that facility, including safety issues, which affected their in facility students and the faculty teaching in the program. Sense that correcting these issues is an administrative duty, not a faculty duty. Still receiving feedback and concerns, including from adjunct faculty on impacts to their load. LRCFT is working on helping to reassign these faculty.
 - i. Question: Would the PREP committee and the DAS body have an interest in bringing forward a resolution in support of the program at Mule Creek Prison? This may help add weight to the request for administration to help solve the issues.
 1. Yes, the PREP committee chair is open to this and would like to bring a resolution forward. They will discuss this at their next meeting.
 2. Sense that the administration, from the Chancellor down, has not exhibited a great amount of care in administering this program at Mule Creek.
5. Instructional Accessibility Committee - Beki Mendel
 - a. The deadline for Title II accessibility compliance has been [extended to April 26, 2027.](#)
 - b. DIAC has been having discussions about possible changes to its committee structure in order to better facilitate the work of the Accessibility Capability Maturity Model (ACMM). Sense that there needs to be broad institutional representation and that a different structure could facilitate this representation.

For example, perhaps DIAC should become a subcommittee of the educational technology committee (Ed Tech) rather than DAS. The committee is reviewing this idea, but the general sense of the committee is that they support the idea of restructuring.

- i. Question from DAS body: will we hear more about the DIAC's interest in moving away from DAS and no longer being a Senate led committee? In the past, there has been concern around Ed Tech not being senate led, since so many aspects of educational technology touch 10+1. Interest in hearing some additional information and rationale around this idea.
 1. Response from DIAC chair: there is a sense in the DIAC group that to effectively address accessibility issues in the district, there needs to be a broader, institution-wide group working on the issues. Sense that the UDA aspect sometimes gets crowded out and overlooked. This UDA aspect of DIAC's work may make sense to stay in DAS purview. There could be a need for two functional spaces to work on these issues. Nearly all current initiatives at the CCC level are linked to UDA. Perhaps we need to expand rather than shrink or restructure.
- c. The UDA coordinator job descriptions have been reviewed. The job descriptions have been posted at FLC and CRC. ARC is pursuing a 1.0 UDA coordinator through a critical hire process. CRC is still working on clarifying their UDA role.

6. District Affordable Learning Materials Committee – Andi Adkins Pogue

- a. No report.

Decisions

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Affirm [Policy-7910](#) Recommendation from the NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) Task Force (Second Reading - vote postponed).

Discussion:

- Acknowledgement that not every campus is ready to vote on this topic
- ARC has shared this policy with the Native American Resource Center Faculty Coordinator for initial feedback before it comes to the Senate.
- Note that NAGPRA is a federal law. It is not optional.
- From a faculty academic freedom perspective, we are interested in lifting the [NAGPRA Moratorium](#) that we are currently under, which currently prohibits faculty from using artifacts and items that do not actually fall under NAGPRA

- There are now two separate NAGPRA policies. These two policies were initially one policy. Over time, it became clear that it made sense to split into two policies: one to address internal policies and one to address federal NAGPRA requirements.
- Sense that the NAGPRA policy is a straightforward statement of how we comply with the law. Sense that the policy that may be more controversial is the Human Remains Recommendation (Decision item #2), because it deals with issues of ethics and the human body. There are no laws governing the ethics of skeletons outside of Native American human remains. Creating these recommendations required a careful balance between people's various sense of ethics around human remains (and replicas of human remains) and violating free speech rights of faculty to use human remains as a teaching tool.
- Acknowledgement that people have different value structures and it is a difficult topic to come to consensus on
- Will the district's NAGPRA Director position continue?
 - Being compliant with NAGPRA is an ongoing process. There are still human remains and cultural objects that need to be repatriated. For now, the work continues.
- Interest expressed from ARC Senate President to understand the timeline of the work to repatriate the remains and the items.
 - NAGPRA Director is happy to talk about this work with anyone who is interested
 - There were human remains at all four colleges, with ARC and SCC having the vast majority. Some have already been repatriated.
- What is an example of a situation involving human remains that raises the ethical and first amendment/academic freedom concerns?
 - SCC has a child skeleton from India that originated from a time where there was a lot of illicit body snatching. Traditionally in Indian culture, the remains would be cremated, but people stole the bodies before they were cremated and sold them as specimens. Many people would find it morally abhorrent to use this specimen in a class, but it falls outside of NAGPRA and there is no law that prohibits it being used as a teaching tool. It is an issue to impose upon a faculty member what they can and cannot do, even if you would never actually use that specimen. Sense that we don't want a government agency (the LRCCD) telling us what we can and cannot do in the classroom. Individual departments are empowered to make their own decisions and policies. They have the right to make the decision not to use those types of items. But sense that it should not be a district-wide policy/prohibition.
- Please take this back to your Senates for input. It will return to DAS May 5.

2. Affirm [Policy-7920](#) Human Remains Recommendation from the NAGPRA Task Force (Second Reading).

- a. Discussed with item #1, see notes above

3. Proposal to revise the LRCCD [Emergency Closure Distance Education addendum](#). (First reading).

Discussion:

- This is a minor but very important tweak to language in the COR regarding the ability to shift a course to an online format in the case of a campus emergency. It will add verbiage that requires consultation with the Academic Senate in order to move a course to an online format in the case of a campus emergency.
- Proposed revision:
 - “During a college/facility emergency closure, **as mutually agreed upon by the college Academic Senate and college president**, this course may be offered via distance education.”
- Does this change mean we would need to convene the entire Academic Senate to consider a request to close campus for an emergency?
 - No. The Academic Senate President and officers would provide the consultation
 - Suggestion that there could be certain types of emergencies that were agreed upon in advance that courses would need to move online, such as major fire, flood, earthquake, etc. These could be locally agreed upon and could vary by campus.
- This is not a novel concept; this language was taken from Contra Costa college. This is in practice elsewhere.
- This would be easily copy/pasted into every COR.
- Curriculum is the purview of the Academic Senate.
- Please take this back to your senates for input

4. Proposal to affirm DIAC recommendation to [Initiate an RFP Process for a Comprehensive Accessibility Technology Suite](#) (First reading).

Discussion:

- The language in this proposal mentions STEM courses, but doesn't acknowledge the difficulties faced by arts courses, such as photography, theater. When/how would accessibility issues for arts courses be addressed?
 - The accessibility suite RFP would address the arts as well. One of the requirements is for tools that would work across multiple disciplines. Math was

separated as a different RFP because it is usually its own separate tech, such as MathPix, which allows for MathML.

- Currently, we use Ally in Canvas. We've had it since 2019, and that's the last time there's been an evaluation of a comprehensive tool. Interest in surveying the current landscape of options.
- The reason why there are specific tools called out for Math is because there is a need for a tool that can address equations. Other tools would address visual materials. We are ready to ask for whatever is needed. If there are tools that are needed that are specific to a discipline, we should be doing RPFs for those as well.
- If we discover specialty tools that would be useful, we may need to investigate how those could be acquired or perhaps include those in the proposal.
- Traditionally how many faculty are involved in an RFP process?
 - Unclear on the answer to this. Typically, RFPs are district-initiated. It can be a very involved process. Should faculty who have discipline-specific needs be on the RFP committee? Should we ask that a certain number of faculty be on the committee?
 - Opinion that it would be helpful for DIAC to make suggestions for the faculty composition of the committee
- Appreciation expressed for this issue being brought forward. Appreciation for this being a faculty-initiated request.
- Sense that it would be ideal for faculty to be able to test and give feedback on the options, as well as students if it were a student-facing tool. Sense that DO is very open to this type of feedback from users.
- Please bring this back to your senates and your UDA coordinators
 - SCC does not have a current UDA coordinator. What is the update on the UDA coordinator job descriptions going out?
 - Announcement has not gone out at SCC; there is uncertainty on who this role should report to
 - CRC posted theirs
 - FLC posted theirs
 - ARC's job description is set but the job has not yet been posted. May depend on the outcome of ARC's critical hire request for a full time permanent UDA coordinator.
 - ARC is pursuing both the critical hire and the .5FTE coordinator. ARC's job description will first go to the Senate, then will be posted once it's been reviewed.
 - Lots of frustration with the .5 FTE role. Concerns about this being a full time role with a half-time compensation.

Reports

(5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1.

Discussion

(10-15 minutes per item)

1. Request for .75 Registration for MESA students.

- a. What is the process for giving priority registration to student groups?
 - i. Some groups are given priority registration in Title 5, such as student parents. Others are granted by discretion, such as athletes.
- b. Suggestion from DAS president to remit this item to the District Equity and Student Success Committee for their recommendation and input. This type of decision has not been made by DAS.
- c. A few years ago, we discussed priority registration for learning communities. There were issues, such as what is the definition of a learning community? Do we still have the notes from this discussion?
- d. It was noted that if priority registration is granted to MESA, a lot of other groups would want it as well, and we do not have a process for considering such requests.
- e. Interest in understanding more about the request from the MESA folks.
- f. If this issue went to DESS for a recommendation, would it first come back to DAS?
 - i. Yes. they are a subcommittee of DAS and would make recommendations to DAS, which we would either approve or not
 - ii. Input from DESSC chair: she was part of the effort to bring in priority registration for athletes. Suggestion that the four MESA programs talk with the folks who made the requests for athletes a few years ago.
 - iii. DESSC welcomes the opportunity to do the legwork on investigating this issue and reporting back to DAS.
 - iv. Suggestion that DESSC take up the question of the process for requesting priority registration, rather than a specific MESA request.
 1. What are the considerations for priority registration?
 2. What might be some criteria to evaluate requests for priority registration?

There was a motion to ask DESSC to explore a process to look at legal and equity implications of priority registration for various groups, is it doable from A&R standpoint, is it fair across all the colleges, etc etc. Motion was seconded. Motion was unanimously approved

2. Equivalency Process: Should we consider a district-wide EQ process when candidates are applying at multiple colleges?

- Issues with the equivalency process occur frequently. Our current process is fraught. The official policy is that if a candidate applies for a similar position at

two colleges, whichever committee gets to it first, that committee's decision becomes final districtwide.

- However, we have no mechanism in place to let the other campuses know of the equivalency decisions, and sometimes the campuses make different decisions about the same candidate. There is no appeal process if someone is denied equivalency. Is this body interested in figuring out how to improve this process?
- Examining the issues with our current process – can it be fixed or repaired? Should we reboot it entirely? We could look at how other multi-college districts handle this. This is firmly a 10+1 issue. We don't need to ask anyone's permission to take up this issue.
- Suggestion to bring this back to the Council of Chairs committees at each college to get input.
- Would like to broad input from faculty and department chairs
- Some committees are very well informed about the process, read the current [min quals handbook](#) etc. Other committees get no training.
- Opinion that the burden should be on the applicant to identify which of their credits meet the min quals. Currently, the committee must comb through transcripts to try and identify how the person might meet the min quals.
 - Other colleges do have such a process that puts the onus on the candidate to explain why they meet min quals.
- Observation that there is a lot of debate at the ASCCC level about the disciplines list and min quals and which degrees should be included in min quals for various disciplines.
- Opinion that it is worthwhile to take this back to department chairs to get their input. We should also consider how we train faculty to do min quals. Could there be a standardized set of instructions, so that every faculty would understand the expectations?
- Issues with the more nebulous criteria for granting min quals. Experts/discipline faculty may easily be able to identify "eminence," but if there are outside faculty on the committee, they may be less able to do so. This issue of evaluating "eminence" commonly affects the arts department hiring processes
- Observation that we have heard several public comments over the years on issues related to how HR is addressing EQs. We are experiencing structural barriers at the district level relating to HR.
- Observation that HR tends to take a hands-off approach when evaluating min quals. If there is any question, they tend to not try and make a determination and instead ask the hiring committee to do so.
- Opinion: highly in favor of revising the eq process ([R-5123](#)) and creating a districtwide process. Hearing a lot of conversation about how we need better control over this process. We have been working on this issue for many years – at least since 2019. Each time a work group has tackled this issue, the issues come back to where the locus of control should be, and timing. Can we do this districtwide work in a timely fashion? Are we willing to lose a little bit of control in order to develop a better process? A lot of work has gone into these discussions,

and then it comes back, and we don't move on it because there are seemingly insurmountable issues of relinquishing local control.

- Expression in favor of reviewing this policy. The loss of control issue is large but worth tackling.
- It would be possible to decouple the regular EQ process from the emergency EQ process.
- Suggestion that a task force could be created. There are many historical documents that this potential future task force could review.

3. ARC Student Senate Resolution/Direction to Hiring Manual Revision Task Force Members

- a. Not discussed, tabled until next meeting

4. R-2222: What is "attendance?"

- a. Question from CRC faculty: I have a student that shows up in an on ground class but doesn't do any work. Can I drop them?
 - i. Opinion expressed: Yes, if you put this in your syllabus
 - ii. Opinion: we don't want to micromanage how faculty operationalize this. We want to give instructors flexibility.
 - iii. Concern expressed: think about from the student perspective - let's say a student is attending class, but maybe are not active participants in the instructor's mind. Can/should they be dropped? Who is defining "active participation?" A student may think that showing up is enough. Question about whether we are allowed to drop students just because they are not turning in work.
 - 1. Note that Title 5 is somewhat nebulous on what defines "attendance," and was written long before online classes.
 - 2. Note that it is very difficult to find a definition of attendance that works for both online and in-person classes.
 - 3. Suggestion to strike the line "not merely presence in a classroom"
 - a. This suggestion will be taken back to the task force

5. Feedback about the AI recommendations from CRC

- a. Appreciation expressed for the way the document threads the needle between the lovers and the haters of AI
- b. Observation that there wasn't much in the document about academic integrity as related to AI
 - i. Task force feeling was that we already have an academic integrity policy, and not wanting to duplicate the policy.

- c. A faculty from CRC felt that there should be something included that commented on the ethical implications of using AI. Such as potential negative impacts on the environment, community, individuals.
 - i. This will be brought back to task force

6. DAS Leadership transitions

- a. There has been a recent announcement that current DAS President Paula Cardwell will become the Dean of Natural Sciences at SCC, starting 4/22/26. Congratulations, Paula! The DAS bylaws state that the Academic Senate President from the college where the the DAS president came from will appoint a new president. How should we handle this?
- b. Concern that Lori's load is not currently designed to accommodate the workload of both DAS President and her current teaching load
- c. Lori is willing to step in at any time
- d. Suggestion that we should look at our bylaws again with an eye toward transitions. Does it make sense for the incoming DAS president to take over immediately after the final meeting when there are still two weeks left in the semester? It creates a situation where you are doing two jobs without being properly compensated.
- e. FLC Academic Senate President appointed Lori Petite as incoming DAS President, thank you Lori!

Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

- None

Future Returning Items:

- Affirm Recommendation from DESSC to adopt the [Los Rios Artificial Intelligence Guidelines](#). (Second Reading).
- Proposal to revise [Regulation-2222](#) (Attendance) (Second Reading).
- Not-for-Credit Curriculum Process

Upcoming Meetings / Events

- April 20 District Equity and Student Success Committee (DESSC) Meeting, 2:30 pm
- April 21 District Academic Senate Meeting, 3-5 pm, DO Main Conference Room
- April 23 District Ed Tech, 3 pm
- April 24 District Curriculum Coordinating Council (DCCC) Meeting, 2:30 pm
- April 27 Senate/Union Joint Issues Committee (SUJIC) Meeting, 2-3 pm

- April 27 Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting, DO Board Room
- May 4 Public Safety Advisory Committee Meeting, 3-4 pm, DO Board Room
- May 4 District Affordable Learning Materials (DALMC) meeting, 3:30 pm
- May 5 District Academic Senate Meeting, 3- pm, DO Main Conference Room
- May 7 Prison Re-Entry Program Committee Meeting, 9 am

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	