## Approved Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roster</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Lopez</td>
<td>FLC</td>
<td>DAS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Crump</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>DAS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Aguilar</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Shubb</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>AS Vice President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janay Lovering</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Giusti</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>AS Past President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Mills</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Carter</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>AS Vice President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnisha Lugo</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Oliver</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>AS Past President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Haug</td>
<td>FLC</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Royer</td>
<td>FLC</td>
<td>AS Vice President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fletcher</td>
<td>FLC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Myers</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cirrone</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Pitman</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginni May</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS Past President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyan Pease</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Dieli</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminaries

1. Call to Order at 3:04pm
   - Introduction of Guests---none.
   - Approval of the Agenda---approved.
   - Announcements---none.
   - Approval of the Minutes (March 6)---deferred.
   - Public Comment---none.

Information Items

1. Recap of March LRCCD Board of Trustees meeting
   During Public Comment, a student and several members of the faculty addressed the Board with requests for changes to the way that complaints of sexual harassment are handled by the District. After the comments, Chancellor King responded that there would be a response to the public comments. Lopez reported that since the Board meeting, the Chancellor’s Executive Staff has had discussions.

2. Recap of LRCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting
   Change to Regulation 5121 that no faculty member will be rehired if the faculty member retired or resigned during a sexual harassment investigation in which the charges are found to be true.
   There is a proposed policy on student health services (R-2523) tied in with a $350,000 grant (with a match from the District) for mental health services in partnership with Wellspace. In Fall 2018, there will be a student health fee of $20/semester (not Summer). Questions were brought up on whether the students will be voting on this fee (as is done with the Universal Transit Fee) or is this a fee that can be approved directly by the Board. Lopez has a copy of the proposed policy and that will be shared with local senates. He also noted that there will be a second reading on April 23.
   Pitman noted that there has been a District Mental Health work group which produced a mental health report that was presented to the Board approximately two years ago, plus a needs assessment. She expressed concern about the lack of communication with this group.

Action:

Lopez to share copy of the proposed student health fee policy with senate presidents (to be shared with local senates)

Lopez to get clarification on the process for approval of fees.

Put on the DAS agenda for the next meeting.
Fully Online Community College proposal in the Governor’s proposed budget--King noted that this is the first priority of the Governor and we are still waiting for details. He noted that his initial stance is to not oppose the proposal.

AB 705---Vice Chancellor Nye reported that the District is not interested in changing ENGWR 300 from 3 units to 4 units. Myers reminded the Chancellor’s Cabinet that this is a curricular issue—being one of the 10+1 of the academic senators. Nye also sees the reading component being integrated into the co-requisite courses for ENGWR 300. The need was expressed to have the discipline work groups work on this. It was also noted that the work groups are not going forward with work if the administrator is not present. It was requested that this concern be placed on the DAS agenda.

Action:
DAS agenda item on work activities of the discipline work groups.

3. Compensation for AB 705 Discipline Faculty Leads

Vice Chancellor Matista reported that ESAs will be available for summer work and reassign time (total of 2.0 FTE spread among ten faculty) for Fall.

Action:
DAS agenda item on discussion of who will be compensated.

4. Upcoming ASCCC events
It was noted there is the ASCCC Area A meeting at Merced College on Friday, March 23, and that the District also has a Guided Pathways workshop. Lopez made the recommendation that senate leadership be present at both events.

Decision Items - none

Discussion Items

1. AB 705 Implementation Support and Coordination Team Update (Lopez)
The Team met on March 14 and Lopez, Mays and Royer were in attendance. Lopez noted much of the discussion was based on a recap of the California Acceleration Project (CAP) conference of the previous week.

• Guidance from conference seemed to be contrary to what District is working on.
• May noted that official guidance has not yet come from the Chancellor’s Office (even though several vice chancellors were on the panel at the CAP conference).
• Mention was that reading competency should not be a stand-alone course. Comment was that many colleges are including reading in English composition courses.
• Intent is that students should be starting in transfer the first semester
• “Maximize the probability” phrase in AB 705---plenty of charts showing data that students are just as successful starting at transfer level as opposed to starting with a course lower than transfer level. Also mentioned the Pipeline Effect.
• Los Rios has been planning to start with one level below
• Statistics from Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMA) are not based on actual student placement. There are a lot of variables that have not been considered. Need to collect data from actual students.
• No data of actual students who have been researched. CRC has some data (with some concerns)
• Lopez---we are moving forward with our current plans. Royer noted concern from faculty to not go forward in that our efforts might not be what the Chancellor’s Office official guidance statement will call for.
• Reassurance to Reading faculty that no full-time reading faculty will lose their jobs. Concern from reading faculty that they will be assigned to lab classes and they don’t see that as “protecting their jobs.”
• Myers noted that he made statements at Chancellor’s Cabinet expressing concern that reading might go away, not just the reading competency; also concerned about off-the-cuff remarks made by CAP presenters.

2. Edits to Regulation 3412 regarding District Matriculation and Student Success Committee (Mays)
Concern has been raised by some that the work of the committee is becoming less relevant with the introduction of various statewide initiatives that create work groups, and that the work groups don’t include the committee. But it was also felt that there is the need for committee that can be “nimble and wide-ranging,” also bring in a district-wide perspective with the possibility of the sharing of best practices. The need of participation of more instructional faculty was strongly expressed. Mays noted discussion on language in the regulation (3412) for the committee will continue with it being taken back to the local matriculation/SSP committees for discussion. She also noted that there is consensus to continue as an arm of the DAS.

3. Edits to Regulation 3412 regarding District Academic Senate (Lopez)
There were questions about what are “all other recommendations” (section 1.0). It was noted that we need to carefully consider and reflect on the consequences of any language change. Concern was also expressed about the proposal to include a designee for co-chair positions.

Action:
Lopez will create a Google Doc with proposed edits and background information
May will contact former DAS presidents Connie Zuercher and Phil Smith regarding history of language for this section.

4. Request to increase the number of funded Academic Senate trips (Lopez)
The current MOU between DAS and the District calls for the funding of nine senate trips per college and that the District allocates $38,000 for this purpose. It was noted that there are numerous state initiatives and activities that require senate attendance and participation. It was suggested that a list be compiled of possible events. It was also noted that many events (e.g. ASCCC Curriculum and Accreditation Institutes and Pathways activities) can be covered by other funds.
Action:
Lopez to create Google Doc for DAS members to list possible events eligible for funding.

Reports

1. Meeting with Chancellor
The senate presidents reported that there was a frank discussion of sexual harassment issues in light of the public comments at the Board of Trustees meeting. King stated that the District is looking to commit to conclude all investigations even if the person in question resigns or retires. In response to the concern raised that the “problem is moved from one college to another,” it was stated that there has been only one such instance. After the report out, DAS members emphasized that there is a need to change the culture of treatment of those who have reported—feeling of “victimization of victim.” We need to avoid what has happened in the past. It was also noted that there are instances of sexual harassment of faculty by students. Lopez also reported that there are potential new policies prohibiting faculty from dating current student and relations with those in “positions of authority.”

2. College Academic Senate President Reports
Response to query from last DAS meeting regarding use of IGETC and/or CSU GE to satisfy the general education pattern for the local degree:

SCC---IGETC/CSU---support for kinesiology and multicultural. Will be discussed at next meeting.
FLC---IGETC/CSU---referred to curriculum committee for input.
CRC---IGETC/CSU---on agenda for Friday; also noted that the Fully Online Community College and meta majors are also on the agenda.
ARC---IGETC/CSU---no consensus or direction; also noted the need for Senate Union Joint Issues Committee (SUJIC) discussion on workplace safety and the need for training on what to do (e.g. lockdown), especially as a result of a text alert at ARC on February 14—“ARC EMERGENCY: Police are responding to a crime in progress at XXX. Avoid the area.”

Aguilar suggested April 9 as a possible date for a SUJIC meeting as Chancellor’s Cabinet usually meets at that time, but they will be having a special meeting before the Board meeting on April 11 instead.

3. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) (Pease)—no report.

4. District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (DM&SSC) (Mays)—see Attachment A. Mays noted that they are also using the ASCCC requests for Guided Pathways liaison to bolster argument for faculty/senate involvement in guided pathways.

5. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) (Dieli)—no report.

6. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) (May)

7. Los Rios College Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) (Presidents/Perrone)---1) still working to align contract regarding change in faculty who teach sections that have SB 1359 designation of ZTC (zero textbook cost) textbooks and the new instructor does not wish to use the ZTC textbook, and 2) District is looking at paying for sexual harassment prevention training. Note: DAS member asked if there has there been any discussion on how sick leave on absence reports is documented?
Future Agenda Items

1. Consideration to explore the use of CSU GE and IGETC as satisfying the GE pattern for the local degree

2. Mobile Device Management

3. Online Education Initiative (OEI) Exchange Update (Dieli)

4. Update of Research into Noncredit Viability at LRCCD (Crump, May)

Future Events

Next DAS meeting – April 3, 3:00-5:00, DO

• LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, April 11, Sacramento City College
• ASCCC Area A Meeting, March 23, Merced College
• ASCCC 2018 Spring Plenary Session, April 12-14, San Mateo Marriott
• ASCCC 2018 CTE Leadership Institute, May 4-5, Southern California
• ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute, June 14-16, Sheraton Park Hotel, Anaheim
• ASCCC Curriculum Institute, July 11-14, Southern California

Adjourned at: 4:59pm

ATTACHMENT A:

Los Rios Community College District
District Matriculation & Student Success Committee
Report to District Academic Senate
March 20, 2018

1. **DMSSC Crosswalk with current initiatives and intersections with local campus governance structures** – As the charge and the relevance of DMSSC has been questioned several times in the past year, the Committee agreed to suspend the regular meeting format and to work together in small groups to discuss the intersection of DMSSC and various initiatives which are impacting the student experience in California Community Colleges. The various initiatives were presented on a matrix or crosswalk with X’s indicating how the initiative had an intersection with the current charge of DMSSC (see separate document attached). Guided Pathways is the more comprehensive initiative and the one which includes several pillars designed to increase student success. The questions developed in advance of the meeting by Melanie Dixon and Judy Mays included the following:

2. Should our Committee structure represent our value/s related to the student experience in the Guided Pathways framework? What structural consideration should we make to support our values/s?

3. What role if any, do you see DMSSC having in relation to the following existing workgroups?
   a. Orientation Workgroup
b. iSEP Workgroup  
c. Probation and Dismissed Students Workgroup  
d. Student Life Experience (SEL) Workgroup

4. What is the intersection between DMSSC and Student Equity/Equity agenda?

5. Are there any other initiatives, workgroups or ways in which DMSSC should support the student experience rooted in the Guided Pathways framework?

There were a total of three groups with four people in each group which reported out at the end of the discussion. Below is an overall summary of the ideas presented in response to the questions above:

**Question #1**
- There is consensus on the need for a districtwide group to provide overall guidance on the values represented within the Guided Pathways framework; there was also consensus to embrace all components of the Guided Pathways framework
- It is important for information to flow to the governance structures at the campus level appropriate
- Would embracing a focus on the Guided Pathways model now exclude LRCCD colleges that are not yet implementing the framework?
- A matriculation or onboarding process that is seamless, accessible, and meaningful and eliminates barriers is important
- Should the name of the committee be based on the particular initiative or on our values as a district?
- There could be future mandates which cause another shift in how we do things; when initiatives change, our values could remain the same
- There was a recommendation to change the name of DMSSC to the Student Success Committee as a way of being more inclusive
- Does the current committee composition include the right people?
- There is a strong need and desire to include more instructional faculty participation on the Committee; Guided Pathways is very curricular focused in its framework and supports the integration of student services and instruction and breaking down the silos

**Question #2**
- Currently communication issues exist between workgroups and DMSSC because there is no linkage or flow of information; there is the potential for duplication of effort
- If there are numerous people working on the various workgroups and then representatives from the workgroups are assigned to serve on the district committee, would it become unmanageable?

**Question #3**
- Student equity is rooted in the Guided Pathways model and is the lens through which everything should be considered; however, it was acknowledged that defining student equity from a district perspective could be a challenge

**Question #4**
- Student Equity initiative and the Basic Skills Initiative do not currently have a district wide governance structure
- Is there a need for steps to success workgroup? A way to track students and nudge them through the enrollment steps?
- There is a new funding formula on the horizon and it is not certain at this point how it will impact our colleges in the future; it is very likely to include a formula that is in part based on how well our colleges address the achievement gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMSSC Committee Charge (SSSP Focused)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured Onboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrating basic skills and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerating to college level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proactive academic and career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs that are mapped out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsive student tracking systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 705 (Multiple Measures/H.S. GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 19 (California Promise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>