## Approved Minutes

### Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Status</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tressa Tabares</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fletcher</td>
<td>FLC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Pitman</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Petite</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS Vice President</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Guzman</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>AS Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Myers</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>ARC</td>
<td>District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminaries
(10 min)

1. Call to Order at 3:04pm
   - Introduction of Guests---approved.
   - Approval of the Agenda---approved.
   - Approval of minutes (11/6)---approved.
   - Announcements
   - Public Comment (3 minutes per person as time permits)

Information Items
(~15 min)

1. November Chancellor’s Cabinet Recap

To discussed under Discussion Item #2

2. Institute on Scaling Guided Pathways District-Wide, LRCCD attended the 2-day event in San Diego on 11/28-11/29

   Lopez noted that it was a good institute. There were teams of five (1-2 faculty per team). He noted that the districtwide group will have more faculty. A takeaway for him was the need for design principles for district collaboration and college autonomy. He also noted the need for us to talk more among ourselves---feels we are more aligned than we think.

3. Update on Collegial Consultation IBA facilitation status

It is planned for January 14 (before the start of instruction). There has also been mention from King of a mini retreat with the main theme of collegial consultation. Lopez will be meeting with King this Thursday and have further discussions.

Decision Items
(~45 min)

1.

Discussion Items
(~45 min)

1. Faculty Hiring Manual Update (Lopez, Carter)
Lopez noted that the purpose of this item is to go over feedback from faculty on the updated Manual.

Rosario gave a background on diversity hiring activity in the district. She noted that Los Rios faculty, staff, and administrators attended a regional training workshop (March 26-27) by the Center for Urban Education (CUE) with a district follow up on April 27. There was also a district workshop presented by CUE on October (with the opportunity for attendance by 50 faculty from each of the four colleges). A major activity is to look at hiring practices and possible gaps with the goal of diversifying faculty to reflect student demographics. One of the major artifacts to be revised is the Faculty Hiring Manual. A work group of college and district members (including one faculty member from each college, plus Lopez for DAS) was formed. The first discussion was about interests and a PowerPoint was presented to DAS (see Attachment B). The group had a robust dialogue to “turn this document on its ear.”

Comments on changes to the Faculty Hiring Manual:

- Section 7 had the most comments.
- Suggestion to not include Supplemental Question in the job announcement/application, but, rather, to be send out to candidates after the screening process.
- Do applicants receive an automated response? Yes. Maybe request for further information can be included in that automated response.
- Time factor of five days from HR to colleges (and the committees)
- Changes to the Adjunct sections of the Manual will occur in the Spring semester.
- Need to revisit the Equity Hiring handbook.
- “Hiring the Best” training has been updated---there have been more scenarios.
- Need to look at Equity Hiring handbook.
- Diversity in pool changed from applicant pool to interview pool.
- Faculty demographic data has not changed over last 10 years. Looking at demographics of pool before…
- CUE training was “amazing” and would like to think it is more available for faculty. Maybe make it be the “Hiring the Best” training or tailor it to Los Rios training.
- Need for involvement of Senate presidents and vice presidents in any training.

The next meeting of the work group is on December 14, 3:00-4:30pm

Lopez noted that DAS was to have discussed the Manual at the November 20 DAS meeting which was cancelled because of the air quality closure) and that there is a desire to have the revised Manual approved by DAS in order for it go go to the Los Rios Board of Trustees for approval at their January meeting. Which would necessitate a suspension of the rules and for this meeting to be a “first read.” Concern was expressed that the changes are too dynamic (i.e. need for more discussion, feedback, and vetting) for a suspension of the rules. There was then discussion---this could be seen as deliberately speeding up and there will be uproar from some faculty, if we “slow” this down, we need to make sure we are accommodating “resisters,” the other college senates have not had the robust discussion that SCC has had, draft was sent out to all CRC faculty and feedback has been received.

Carlos needs names from senate presidents
2. President Greene and Dean Reske visit to share their work on ARC Online and the Los Rios Online Education Consortium Concept (and the role of faculty)

Greene provided a context of how we got to this and where we are now. He also noted the addition of a new last page—“how the concept emerged.”

- They will be creating environment---1) there will be competition where there currently isn’t and 2) there will be colleges that are prepared right now.
- Price is not necessarily a factor when students are choosing a course section as we all charge the same fee. Quality is the major factor. We need to formalize online education and look at it more programatically.
- ARC created a VEC---virtual education center, (just like our outreach centers) and created the position of Dean of Virtual Education and also hired a faculty position of universal design coordinator. Creation of ARC Online (iteration 1.0). We also recognize on how to create and develop an online program, not just a cobbled of courses. ARC Online 2.0---doing work this fall term.
- Green felt that as a district, we need to come together. Moving more quickly than he thought (months as opposed to years).
- Changes in the statewide Online Education Initiative (OEI)---combined with the California Virtual Campus (CVC) and is now the California Virtual Campus (Online Education Initiative). They have dropped home-grown system and gone with a commercial vendor. There is a clarity about branding and badges for online tutoring and online counseling. He noted that courses with these badges will come up first in a CVC search.
- Time frame of when courses are offered (e.g. four weeks, six weeks, eight weeks, full term).
- Bottom line---historically we have had competition between colleges. Our main online competitor will be CVC (OEI), not each of the Los Rios colleges. We need to create a quality Los Rios offering of courses and programs.
- When we participate in CVC (OEI), we have the opportunity to have outside students take Los Rios courses and be encouraged to take more courses here in Los Rios.

This led us to how we maintain the individuality of the colleges and create an infrastructure to help all four colleges. We need to move quickly, and with agility. There is a lot to be designed---this is just a concept. How to develop process. Not trying to facilitate buy-in, but to develop collaboration among the four colleges.

Reske noted that, at the most basic level, students can go out to the other Los Rios colleges and see what is offered. Because we are part of the OEI Exchange (seamless enrollment process), it can be very easy for our students to take courses outside of the district. Scaling ARC Online---code, etc. can be shared with the other Los Rios colleges. There is a lot that can happen right now. We do get attention from OEI, we do CAN-Innovate.

Greene is a member of the CVC-OEI Advisory Committee. He is hearing that a lot of colleges don’t have the capacity to review courses. ARC is the only college to have the authority to self-approve online courses. He thinks they might be creating regional centers for course review. We can rapidly set up that infrastructure.
This came out of ARC, we saw this coming and put this idea together. It was presented to Chancellor’s Council. It has not yet been shared with VPs of Instruction and Student Services. We wanted to have conversation with academic senates.

Questions/Comments:
Will there be a requirement of an in-person attendance? No. Faculty have the choice at this time.
Can it be considered online if there is proctoring? Yes.
Do you think there will be any state tracking of badged classes? Greene---there has been the discussion in OEI about collecting data (not specifically about badged sections). There might be analysis about continuing courses (e.g. will badges influence success?)
Has there been discussion about offering online coursework in different time frames? How do we support faculty in using shorter-term time periods? Greene—CVC-OEI is compiling a list of recommendations for regulatory relief (at December meeting).
Looking at “Finish Faster”---no way of knowing if there are spaces in the section. Need to provide real-time section availability data. Reske---that is not what is going to be launched. Students will be using CCCApply---will be seamless.
How does this all get decided? How do we participate? Greene---bigger conversation than just online.
Collaboratively designing structure which focuses on faculty----articulation, collaborative faculty professional development. Example of something that doesn’t need high-level collaborative----search tool (more need of technical development).
We have a function problem. We are not good at proposing and implementing. This needs to be seen as a district 10+. Don’t want us to have governance to be seen as a problem, want to see “empowerment.”
We still have the same people involved, but we are having lots of training. Different group working on projects who are empowered/charged to accomplish things (but not to go “rogue”)
What is timeline? Greene---some things have a sense of urgency. Can do things better together than alone. We have opportunity, be we are behind. Example of Coastline College and its military programs.
Timeline in draft. Conversation on “how to approach this” will be next conversation point. Greene encouraged Aguilar and Shubb to share the new processes at ARC. It is not designed to maintain the status quo, but very focused and resourced to accomplish the task.
To what extent have DE coordinators been involved in this? Greene---there hasn’t been any engagement with DE Coordinators (something internally with ARC DE folks). This is the start of the conversation. This is inherently “disruptive.” There is still much work to be decided (and kept) at the college level, e.g. how much FTE will be online at each college. DE Coordinators will be attending the December 18 meeting. There is culture of sharing among Los Rios DE Coordinators.
One concern is that this beautiful model at ARC has been richly resourced, while other colleges might not have these resources (less FTE for DE Coordinator and dean oversight). Greene---there was an assumption that we need to give FTE to start. Another category of resources for all colleges would be how to provide support for faculty online review. How do we strengthen the professional development resources and efforts to benefit all colleges? There is a recognition that more resources will be required. Greene---this last week, Reske and her team developed a video that we thought be helpful. (Reske will share with Aguilar to send to all DAS).
3. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI), LRCCD request for Partnership Resource Team
4. Request to include in-progress units towards student registration priority (Haug) – deferred.

Adjourned at: 5:02pm

Future Events

Next DAS meeting – December 18, 2018 Main Conference Room, DO
● LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, November 7, Folsom Lake College
● LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, December 12, DO
● ASCCC Area A Meeting, March 23,
● ASCCC 2019 Spring Plenary Session, April 11-13, Westin San Francisco Airport
● ASCCC 2019 Career and Noncredit Institute, April 25-27, San Diego
● ASCCC 2019 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 13-16, Sacramento
● ASCCC 2019 Curriculum Institute, July 10-13, Hyatt San Francisco Airport

ATTACHMENT A:

DCCC Report to the District Academic Senate
December 4, 2018

1. Curriculum: All courses and programs on the November 30, 2018 DCCC agenda were approved with the exception one outlines that was held for further discussion at the January meeting. New courses and programs and deletions will appear on the December Board of Trustees agenda.
2. Competency Committees: The DRCC recommended to the DCCC that Completion of the A.S. or A.A. degree satisfy Reading Competency. The DCCC approved this change and is forwarding the proposition to the DAS for discussion and action.
3. New Designators/Thematic Blocks/Families: A new ESLLAB designator and thematic blocks was approved for use at Sacramento City College. New thematic blocks in the ENGED and DCDL designators were approved as well.
4. Collaboration Requests: There are currently 7 open collaboration requests in the District. Progress is monitored by the Curriculum Chairs at each college.
5. SOCRATES Advisory Group (SAG): SAG is working on a variety of issues including a way to produce documentation of CTE course prerequisites review every two years. Phil has developed a report within SOCRATES that shows the last date of review for all CTE programs. The next step will be to develop a process to ensure that proper review and documentation exists.
6. District Report: The latest PPC list was distributed to the curriculum chairs of the colleges. Feedback is due to Tammy Montgomery by December 6th.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dyan Pease
DCCC Chair

ATTACHMENT B:
# Hiring Manual for LRCCD Faculty

## 2018 Review

## Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty members</th>
<th>9/28</th>
<th>10/16</th>
<th>11/9</th>
<th>11/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Laflam (ARC)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Carter (CRC)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Telles (FLC)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Crumpton (SCC)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Lopez (DAS)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Montanez (CRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Garcia (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Cox (DO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Rosario (DO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Knapp (DO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Rios Community College District
Agenda

- Welcome/Introductions
- Purpose
- Outline process & timelines
- College interests
- Interests from CUE attendees
- Strategy for moving forward
- Next meeting date(s)
- Adjourn

Purpose

- Hiring Manual shall be reviewed and revised at least every 3 years.

EDUCATION CODE - EDC

TITLE 3. POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION [66000 - 101060]  (Title 3 enacted by Stats. 1976, Ch. 2010.)

ARTICLE 3. Hiring Criteria [87360 - 87360.]  (Article 3 added by Stats. 1988, Ch. 973, Sec. 28.)

87360.  
(a) In establishing hiring criteria for faculty and administrators, district governing boards shall, no later than July 1, 1990, develop criteria that include a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.

(b) No later than July 1, 1990, hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board, and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.

(c) Until a joint agreement is reached and approved pursuant to subdivision (b), the existing district process in existence on January 1, 1989, shall remain in effect.

(Added by Stats. 1988, Ch. 973, Sec. 28. Operative July 1, 1990, pursuant to Sec. 70(d) of Ch. 973.)
Timeline

- 3 meetings
  - September 28  Meeting #1
  - October 16  Meeting #2
  - November 9 2:30-5:00  Meeting #3
  - November 14 3:00-5:30  Meeting #4
  - November 19  Final Draft
  - December 12  Board Approval

I. Introduction

- Background
- Legal Authority
- Diversity & cultural competence

II. Need

- Department Profile
- Summary of Projected Needs
- Final List
- Review by VPI/SS
- Chancellor
- Critical Hires
### III. Recruitment
- Examine timeline
- Sufficient timeline
- Can't pay for travel
- Increase travel amount
- Hiring flow chart

### Application
- Add diversity statement
- Add teaching philosophy
- Update Equity Question: How does your lived experience address...
- Change the equity question
- Application materials only submitted online

### Announcement
- Update job announcements: more student focus
- Include college demographics in postings
- Make postings user-friendly

### Advertising
- Where/how jobs advertised?
- Affinity group advertising
- Increase $ for ads
- UR advertising paid by DO
- Limited funds to post jobs

### IV. Screening Eligibility (Pre-)
- EO process is restrictive
- Only go off degrees on announcement
- Change listed degrees

### V. Interview Committee
- Disrupt our committees
- Academic Senates need to look at "list" to get appointed. Needs to change.
  - Work with Senate re: their appointments
  - Change rules re: how committee members selected
  - Outside of discipline committee members
  - Equity rules are not "racial equity" focused
  - Always a student on committee
  - Increase use of community members
  - Chair & equity rep only members required to be present at meetings
  - Training for chairs

### V. Interview Committee (continued)
- Anonymous Screening: remove names from applications
- Minimize the number screening days-use a formula, number of apps VS how long screening takes place
- Tie CUE to the Equity Reps (Hiring the Best)

### VI. Screening Applications
- Training on more thoughtful rubrics
- More equity focused; ability v. experience
- More training on screening criteria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Interview</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Questions (continued)</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Can’t email questions&lt;br&gt;• Can’t work together on question design&lt;br&gt;• Applicant only has 1 timeslot to interview&lt;br&gt;• Offer ccc-confer for all&lt;br&gt;• Offer phone for all</td>
<td>• More dialogue&lt;br&gt;• Clarify questions&lt;br&gt;• Know what you are asking for&lt;br&gt;• Allow for follow up question(s)&lt;br&gt;• Make more comprehensive&lt;br&gt;• Have open dialogue&lt;br&gt;• Must have 1 diversity question&lt;br&gt;• Ask more diversity questions&lt;br&gt;• Include/contextualize equity in as many questions as possible</td>
<td>• Provide more reimbursement to fund traveling candidates&lt;br&gt;• Allow CCC Confer&lt;br&gt;• Teleconference if candidate asks&lt;br&gt;• Finalist teaching in front of real students</td>
<td>• Rubric for teaching demo&lt;br&gt;• Scoring doesn’t allow you to eliminate people&lt;br&gt;• Bias towards non-native English speakers (language is a barrier)&lt;br&gt;• Only 3-5 finalists&lt;br&gt;• Can’t compare candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>