



DAS President Julie Oliver

ARC President Alisa Shubb

CRC President Gregory Beyrer

FLC President Paula Haug

SCC President Lori Petite

Tuesday, February 2, 2021
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Approved Minutes

Julie Oliver	CRC	District Academic Senate President	X
Dan Crump	ARC	District Academic Senate Secretary	X
Alisa Shubb	ARC	Academic Senate President	X
Janay Lovering	ARC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Amy Gaudard	ARC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Tressa Tabares	ARC	Academic Senate Past President	X
Greg Beyrer	CRC	Academic Senate President	X
Scott Crosier	CRC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Lisa-Marie Mederos	CRC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Julie Oliver	CRC	Academic Senate Past-President	X
Paula Haug	FLC	Academic Senate President	X
Eric Wada	FLC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Lisa Danner	FLC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
[NONE]	FLC	Academic Senate Past President	
Lori Petite	SCC	Academic Senate President	X
Sandra Guzman	SCC	Academic Senate Vice President	
Kandace Knudson	SCC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Troy Myers	SCC	Academic Senate Past President	X
Eric Wada	FLC	District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC)	X
Jena Trench	CRC	District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)	X
Bernadette Anayah	FLC	District Equity & Student Services Committee (DE&SSC)	X
Jason Newman	CRC	Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT)	X
Guests			
Jamey Nye	DO	Deputy Chancellor	X
Debra Crumpton	SCC	Faculty, Business	X
Teresa Aldredge	CRC	Faculty, Counseling (CRC LRCFT President)	X
LaQuisha Beckum	ARC	Faculty, MESA Coord (LRCFT Part-Time Board Member)	X
Belinda Lum	SCC	Faculty, Sociology (LRCFT Chief Negotiator)	X
Cristian Picazo	SCC	Student/Distance Education Student Advocate	X
Alexis Tarleton	SCC	Student/Distance Education Student Advocate	X
Teresa Lopez	CRC	Classified Professional	X

Preliminaries

1. Call to Order at 3:03pm
2. Welcome and Introduction of Guests
3. Approval of the Agenda---approved.

4. Approval of January 19 minutes---approved.
5. Public Comment (3 minutes per person as time permits)

DAS President's Report

6. Review of meeting notes and weekly recaps and answering of any clarification questions.

See the full text of the DAS President's weekly Recap/Outlook Reports on the DAS page of the District website--
- <https://employees.losrios.edu/our-organization/committees/district-academic-senate>

Decision Items

None.

Discussion Items

1. Antiracism and Equity

Time for reflection on how to infuse antiracism work into everything associated with academic and professional matters.

Video – PBS Judy Woodruff feature---"High School---Race and Being Underestimated"

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/two-students-brief-but-spectacular-takes-on-race-and-being-underestimated>

Black History Month---listing of wide variety of activities throughout the District. Thanks to Beckum for providing this link--- https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_6yPx9tHj5_EnoGMi56J_NdZLplBIJAtdw-DA7UzuJc/edit#heading=h.kpvapssmu8nh

2. LRCCD Reopening Plan [Time Certain 3:15pm]

- *Discussion with Deputy Chancellor Nye who is a member of the district team working on making plans for how to reopen LRCCD for on-ground activities in the future.*
- *Feedback on the draft document released by the reopening team.*

Draft was due on January 29.

Lots of discussion at Chancellor's Cabinet about the Plan, especially about what was left out of the Plan. LRCFT submitted list of concerns/criticisms to Chancellor King and Vice Chancellor Nye.

- Good that equity is front and center in the Plan as a value---how will it be operationalized?
- When do we start marketing the Plan? It would be good to have a strong focus on disadvantaged groups. Reaching out to communities who have been negatively impacted by total online.
- Glad that the process is iterative and can see where the gaps are, e.g. non-instructional faculty were not mentioned as much in the report.
- Definitely a framework, not a plan.
- "Soft opening"---how is that defined?
- Need to include rationale---how/why certain programs are allowed back on campus and other were not.
- Will PPE be provided to faculty, staff and students?
- Will there be extra time between classes?
- Nye noted they are working on union MOUs and Newman hoped they would be available in the next three weeks.
- What can be discussed for the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting next week? What is missing? What is still needed?
- Still might be some level of confusion about the Distance Education (DE) approval process.
 - Nye---VPs are also confused. Will be main focus of Chancellor's Cabinet meeting next week. Not clear from Chancellor's Office on what does "closure" mean. Will have clarity on what closure means and should have understanding by next week. Wada volunteered to join in discussions on that---"with flexibility comes responsibility." There are also outside factors---accreditation and transfer.
- When we make decision---along with publicizing decision, that the rationale is also publicized.
- There are places where future conversations need to happen. Examples---course offerings. Some place

between “partial opening” and “full opening.” Even a “softer” opening where we have more classes than partial, but less than full.

- Nye noted that the group is charged with the scope, not the decisions. Getting feedback from constituent groups. We will come up with multiple decisions. Looking at on-ground courses for Fall. Might be another group of disciplines (athletics, arts) looking forward to these conversations at CC. re: details---when it comes to implementing, it really depends on the program faculty. Example of the “Health 15” (noted in the Plan)---really need the faculty (experts in those areas) to leading the specific planning. Example---directional signs are needed. Worked with LRCFT to come up with a template.
- Especially excited about student services faculty and staff being involved with their programs.
- Nye---when the decision to reopen, we will need to operationalize. We don’t know what will be open or not.
- Besides the Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings, there are other opportunities for input, e.g. King and Nye meet on a regular basis with both senate and union leadership. We want feedback---are committed to that. We are not making decision in a District Office vacuum.
- Students, faculty, staff---"we all need to have trust that we are all safe."
- Need to figure out WiFi on campus, maybe in parking lots/garages. We may all have different comfort levels.

Action:

Chancellor’s Cabinet is meeting on a weekly basis. Request that faculty: 1) give input to senate presidents and 2) directly on the feedback form.

3. Future of Course Scheduling

- *Discussion of how course scheduling will be completed once LRCCD is back on-ground. How will it be determined whether to offer courses in an online or in-person format? What role does the Academic Senate play in these decisions? LRCFT?*

Based on things that Oliver, Newman and Lum have heard.

- What will be the % of online sections with reopening? What will it be? 20 or 30 or 40% ? The DE Addendum is important. Important what we say---make sure our comments cover cross-departmental concerns, not just your department.
- They have been hearing 20+% in discussions with King. Also heard this with discussions of Los Rios Colleges Online (LRCO) before COVID-19.
- We need a needs assessment of both students and faculty. What decisions are data going to make? Need to maintain the areas of senate purview.

Students determine a lot by their choices of sections.

Is it inevitable that we will we get it wrong not matter what we decide?

Are faculty going to be willing to be assigned to the modality that students want?

LRCFT stance is that modality (e.g. online teaching) is voluntary and that it should remain voluntary.

How will we react if there is more student demand for online than full-time are willing to do? Will there be pressure on part-time faculty (they might not feel the ability to say “no” to online sections).

We don’t know what students want. If students want online, that is where we need to be. We don’t have strong evidence/data on what students really want. Need for comprehensive survey of students for what they want---let’s find out what students really want (not just during this time of COVID-19).

LRO concept---discussions need to be more inclusive (currently just a small group of people). Need to make data-driven decisions. Concerns with the path of LRO. Initial discussions on program development are focused on small number of programs at each college. So many complex things---what to offer/FTE/coordinating in, and among, colleges. Outside of this will be student services offerings, e.g. counseling and financial aid.

Difficulty to predict what both faculty and students wants. Some students are saying that they can’t wait to get back to campus. But the pendulum might switch back. Cyclical. We have never emerged from a year-long

closure. Hard to predict human behavior.

Faculty will most likely be vaccinated by Fall and students probably will not. Propose that DAS formally propose a survey conducted under the direction of the District's Communication or Technology division.

DAS needs to make a formal proposal. Surprised that reopening efforts do not include such a survey plan .

Example of modality choice---class is being offered in person, but there are students in the class who decide they don't want to take an in-person. Is it possible for a student to attend an on-ground section as an online student (especially when an online section is not available)? Multi-modal? Could this risk cancellation if there are not enough students enrolled in the on-ground section.

LRCFT concerns about workload for a faculty member who could be teaching the same section as both online and on-ground.

There are some department that are traditionally teaching more online sections than other departments.

Hope that when we return, we can reinvent provision of some of our services.

Learning community---can we use more of that in that sections could be scheduled back-to-back?

Lower enrollment mentioned at other meetings. Classes at other colleges to be used for low enrollment.

Example of advanced education students coming from outside the area to take an online section.

Concern about pitting the concepts of "student-centered" v "faculty workload."

Some of the things we are hearing are not based on research. For online sections, we need to do a lot of work.

Our success rates for online sections needs work.

Questions---who is completing online? Who is it best for? Need to be open for the dialogue. Hybrid and HyFlex---we need to work on this collectively.

Surveying our students doesn't necessarily mean will we do what they ask. It is a strong data point, but we are not giving away our agency. Can be a starting point for discussions.

"Online" means different things to different people.

Clear that we will be requesting surveying. Want us all to be in this "head space" --- "this is coming."

Also need to have local conversations.

Action: Oliver to work with DO to explore the proposal for a survey of constituencies

4. Digital Media Proposal (Trench and Knudson)

Grateful that ARC put the proposal forward as it identified empty space in what training is offered.

Analysis from LMS group (college DE coordinators and district IT and LMS admins) and presented to DETC and reviewed. Basically the ARC proposal calls for build capacity for technology-enhanced instruction via a digital media infrastructure that is district-wide. Missing from our current services is a dedicated professional support team mentioned in the proposal. The college teams do provide some of these functions, but they do not have the capacity to perform those services exclusively---focus is more on teaching faculty on how to use the resources. What is missing from current services is consolidation of staffing and training. We do not have funding for the hiring of a dedicated support staff.

The analysis includes comparison tables of different available services.

Next steps---really good idea to provide some easy way to provide information of what services we currently have. Just like Pathways, we want to show faculty what services are available. It is felt that we can solve most of the concerns brought up in the proposal. A group of Ed Tech and DO IT will conduct a deeper inventory of available resources. VC Tamara Armstrong will be leading effort in cataloging and analyzing what things are available. Knudson and Angela Prelip have volunteered to work on this.

- What additional time will faculty have to do the training and do the work? This is a workload issue.
- Proposal aims to help you be most effective with your time.
- Will this group have any role in making determinations of what works best with Canvas? Example of video links that don't work in Canvas. Can they address that?
- Trying to help faculty determine what tool will best help. Need to find out about what Canvas integrations work and what don't work.

- In terms of consolidating. You have pointed to tools what are best for a certain need. What is going to be the central place? Will there be a “hub” where we will know the “official” Los Rios tool? Knudson---not to be ruled out. Trench---there are some platforms that do a better job than others to maintain things like academic freedom and copyright.
- How do we support individual faculty expressions of freedom to innovate and teach in regard to help faculty with tools that are not officially supported by the District? Additional example---if YouTube is going to be named as a tool to be used in the “suite of tools,” we need Legal to designate YouTube as a supported tool in the Los Rios Google Apps.
- Appreciate freedom to use, but faculty members also need recommendations and guidance on how to choose and use tools. We get lots of tips, but sometimes need a deeper dive. It was noted that this is the role of the Instructional Development Coordinator---we have full-time coordinators at just ARC and SCC, but it is combined with DE Coordinator position at CRC and FLC.
- The growth of online sections (especially COVID-19 and remote instruction) has greatly overtaxed the DE coordinators and IDCs.

Another issue is test proctoring concerns---Proctorio, privacy and academic integrity. Trench has been tasked to identify set of requirements or needs to maintain academic integrity and test proctoring to help with selecting a new tool to replace Proctorio when that license expires. Need faculty appointments, including representation from student services, and emphasizing with equity perspective and training. Also calling for student appointment. Short timeline---need to come to a decision before expiration of the Proctorio contract.

5. Collegiality in Action (CIA)

- *Debrief of the Jan 27th CIA session facilitated by ASCCC and CCLC.*

DAS had a robust discussion about the online presentation presented by Dolores Davison (ASCCC President) and Sunny Cooke (Superintendent/President of MiraCosta College).

Comments:

- Online made it accessible to more people than usual.
- Scenarios in presentation---answers without as much discussion among participants.
- Need to emphasize power/authority of academic senate in Title 5 and Ed Code, especially Title 5, section 53202.
- Need to have follow-up meetings. Also to do this on a regular basis---we do have turnover in membership.
- Some issues are of college nature as opposed to a district-wide nature---Oliver noted that you can request ASCCC to request a college visit.

Reports (5 minutes per item)

- Meetings with Chancellor, Deputy Chancellor, etc.

The meeting was basically about the Collegiality in Action presentation and the Reopening Plan (See Attachment E).

- College Academic Senate Presidents

CRC---no report.

FLC---no report.

ARC---working on an academic integrity statement. Asking other colleges if there has been any feedback from ARC resolution on class.

SCC---discussions on reopening. Short discussion on email from student re: Proctorio

- District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) (Wada)---see Attachment D.

- District Equity & Student Success Committee (DESSC) (Anayah)---have not yet met (will be meeting February 22), but already working with Snowden.
- District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) (Trench)---see Attachments A and B
- Other meeting reports:
 - o AB705 (Oliver)
 - o Accreditation (Oliver)---
 - o Adjunct Hiring Manual (Crosier)---
 - o Accessibility (DAPIC)(Knudson)---initial list of recommended faculty and specialist responsibilities and training.
 - o Calendar (Oliver)---
 - o College Bookstores (Crump)---
 - o Equivalency Task Group (Oliver)
 - o Prison & Reentry Program (Crosier)---
 - o Other...
- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (Oliver)---Area A meeting (March 26) and Spring Plenary (April 8-10) Sessions will be virtual.
- Los Rios College Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) (Newman)---see Attachment C

Adjourned at 4:59pm

Future Events:

- Future DAS meetings-February 16, March 2 and 16, April 6 and 20, May 4
- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, Wednesday, February 10, 2021, 5:30pm
- ASCCC Area A Meeting (virtual), Friday, March 26
- ASCCC Spring Plenary Session (virtual), April 15-17

ATTACHMENT A:

District Educational Technology Committee Report (1/28/21)

Digital Media Proposal Analysis

DETC members reviewed the LMS group’s [Analysis of ARC’s Digital Media Proposal](#). ARC’s proposal to “build capacity for technology-enhanced instruction” via a districtwide “digital media infrastructure” asks for a consolidated structure with added services where a splintered model of resources and limited support exists.

In the analysis, you will find a comparison table describing the proposed services and existing resources. With the exception of a dedicated “professional support team”, Los Rios instructors already have access to the services listed in the proposal. Unfortunately, our current budget does not support the hiring of new media specialists.

As a next step, DETC members will be working with DO-IT to conduct a deeper inventory and analysis of our existing media solutions. In collaboration with professional development teams at the four colleges, DE and DOIT teams plan to create clearer and coordinated messaging and training for the use of technological tools and support available in the district.

Test Proctoring Workgroup

DETC discussed the need to explore options for Test Proctoring software. Currently, Los Rios has a contract with Proctorio that expires June 30, 2021.

DETC is recruiting members from the four colleges to serve on a workgroup that will identify requirements to help inform DO-IT's purchase (or renewal) of test proctoring software.

Specifically, we would like faculty representatives from college Academic Integrity and/or DE committees, and a Student Services representative to join this group.

DO-IT needs a set of requirements ASAP in order to plan for Summer session. Therefore the group will only be meeting a few times during Feb/March. Current members include Jena Trench (DECT Co-chair), Tak Auyeung (ARC), Markus Geissler (CRC), and Angela Prelip (FLC).

Please reach out to your colleagues and encourage them to contact me if they wish to participate.

Other Updates

4. J. Nye gave the group a review of current reopening planning, including a description of the membership of the reopening planning group and an acknowledgement of the challenges of planning the Fall Schedule. More information from DO and LCRFT will be provided shortly regarding Fall scheduling.
- The group said goodbye to Mike Day, Director, Production and Technical Services, who is leaving Los Rios to become CIO at Palomar College. An Interim position has already been advertised.
- The [Distance Education Training Requirement](#) course "Foundations of Canvas Course Design" is now open for registration. The course is 2 weeks in duration with an estimated time investment of 15 hours. Completion is mandatory for new hires who will be teaching online, and is optional for faculty who taught online during the Fall 2020 semester. Stipends are available for adjunct faculty, and full time faculty can receive FLEX credit or credit toward salary advancement.

ATTACHMENT B:

Analysis of ARC's Technology Enhanced Instruction Proposal

Overview

ARC's proposal to "build capacity for technology-enhanced instruction" via a districtwide "digital media infrastructure" asks for a consolidated structure with added services where a splintered model of resources and limited support exists. Primarily missing from our current services is a dedicated "professional support team" that would provide on-demand services such as curation, conversion of existing media to different formats, verification of accessibility of digital media, development of tutorials and other support materials, copyright assistance, and dedicated technical support.

While it can be argued that existing DE teams provide each of these functions to an extent, these teams do not have the capacity to perform these functions at the exclusion of their many other duties, thus severely limiting the capacity for provision of these tasks. Rather, DE teams serve more of an educational role for our colleagues rather than a service role; we teach others how to perform these functions instead of performing them on behalf of our colleagues. This is the core difference between what is proposed and what exists.

Technological Components of the Proposal

Although splintered, Los Rios faculty already have access to the great majority of tools outlined in the proposal. The following table provides a list of the proposed technology elements, examples of the tools **currently available** for faculty use, and whether the coordination of existing support staff could facilitate use of existing tools.

Proposed Service	Currently Available	Coordination of existing support staff recommended
Cloud-based video hosting, streaming, and management	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube or Vimeo	No
Individual faculty accounts to upload, download, and manage their videos or other digital media	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube or Vimeo	No
Fully automated (machine generated) captioning paired with the ability for human editing	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube or Vimeo Other external software programs (Screencast-o-matic)	No
Capacity for lecture capture	Third-party software (Screencast-o-Matic; Screencastify) Canvas Studio (Screencast-o-matic Integration) Zoom	No
Ability to store copies of lectures in faculty accounts	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube or Vimeo PlayPosit Zoom	No
Integration with Canvas as well as compatibility with on-ground classroom use of digital media	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube, Vimeo PlayPosit Other video management vendors (paid accounts)	No
Shared space to serve as a repository of resources that faculty can build from the work of their peers	Canvas Canvas Commons Canvas Studio (Potentially) Google Drive Shared YouTube or Vimeo Account/Channel Other video management vendors (paid accounts)	Yes

Proposed Service DISTRICT ACADEMIC SENATE	Currently Available	Coordination of existing support staff recommended
Search engine to allow discovery of curated content and shared digital media	Studio 3CMediaSolutions PlayPosit Other video management vendors (paid accounts)	Yes
Built for interoperability (works on any device) and accessibility (universal design)	3CMedia Solutions Canvas Studio YouTube or Vimeo PlayPosit	No
High-level of confidence in reliability (e.g., uptime and redundancy) to ensure media is available 24-7	Strong track record for: 3CMedia YouTube Though newer, no issues yet reported with Studio or PlayPosit	No
Security features including single sign-on (SSO) to limit access	Canvas Studio Google Drive Canvas Commons PlayPosit	No
Honors intellectual property relationships (i.e., no transfer of ownership based on technology hosting)	All aforementioned tools preserve intellectual property rights of faculty as desired	Yes

Gaps Assessment

An analysis of the proposal versus existing district resources indicates a gap between the level of faculty responsibilities assumed in the proposal and those assumed by the LRCCD currently. Where the current DE teams and DOIT team support faculty in their own robust use of the technological resources, the proposal places the bulk of those responsibilities onto a full-service team that would do much of the work on behalf of the faculty.

For instance, where the proposal creates a team of workers who would curate and manage storage of multimedia content, current district practices and the bargaining agreement place the responsibility for curation and storage of individual instructional materials on faculty. DE and DOIT teams help faculty with technological support when faculty have questions or lack all skills or software access required to facilitate use of district resources, but they do not as a matter of practice do that work for faculty.

Recommendations

If financial resources were unlimited, this recommendation would include a full-service team to support faculty as the proposal suggests. Given the current budgetary crisis in the state, this recommendation instead maximizes current resources, acknowledging the confusion that results from a plethora of existing resources with a lack of coordinated messaging and training to locate

California Title 5, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

The DE teams of the four LRCCD campuses and the DOIT team therefore recommend that

professional development teams at the four campuses collaborate with DE and DOIT teams in order to create clearer and coordinated messaging and training for the use of technological tools and support available in the district. This coordination is necessary in order to help faculty navigate the wide and increasing variety of resources available in the district.

ATTACHMENT C:

LRCFT report to DAS

February 2, 2021

- LRCFT continues to discuss Reopening Plans with senate and district. We are negotiating several MOUs to facilitate a possible return to on ground operations in Fall semester.
- The CFT recently released its legislative update. See attached summary.
- LRCFT Exec. Board will experience a one-hour orientation at each board meeting in Feb/March.
- LRCFT is working with Chancellor King to place a bronze bust of Al Rodda at City College.
- LRCFT Exec. Board continues to formulate an internal Equity Audit for the LRCFT.
- LRCFT continues to negotiate parameters of the Prison Education program.
- LRCFT Pres. attended the *Collegiality in Action* with Senate leadership and BOT.
- LRCFT Pres. Continues to attend COVID-19 update meetings with CFT.
- LRCFT is working on honoring our late President Dean Murakami at our upcoming CFT conference March 26-27.
- LRCFT will host a virtual commemoration of Murakami this semester on a Friday. TBA.
- LRCFT Pres. recently appointed the full complement of delegates (10) allocated to the LRCFT by the Sacramento Central Labor Council.
- LRCFT will provide funds to the upcoming FACCC Advocacy/Policy Conference.

LRCFT President Meetings/phone calls since January 20

- Pre-steering: 1/21: Prison Education program/CARES Act funding/Reopening Plan
- Los Rios Labor Summit: 1/22 (Chancellor King and the other union presidents)
- Steering committee: 1/25
- Angelo Williams: 1/25: PAFC duties
- SUJIC: 1/25
- Chancellor's Cabinet: 1/25
- Steering Committee special meeting: 1/27: The Waiver for 100% remote
- President's meeting 1/27: Steering update
- Collegiality in Action w/Senate leadership: 1/27
- Interview SCC newspaper: 1/27: Los Rios Listening-Sessions
- Interview CRC newspaper: 1/28: Los Rios Equity on Campus
- Los Rios Labor Summit: 1/28: The Reopening Plan
- Deputy Chancellor phone discussion: 1/28: Fall Reopening Plan
- CFT Higher Ed committee: 1/30
- Chancellor's Cabinet 2/1: The Reopening Plan
- UC-AFT Virtual Rally for lecturer contract: 2/1
 - DAS: 2/2
 - CFT: 2/2: Vaccine Update
 - Steering Committee special meeting: 2/3: The Waiver

ATTACHMENT D:

DCCC Report to DAS

2 February 2021

DCCC met on 29 January.

A special meeting will be held on 4 February from 1:30pm-2:00pm to review and consider new to college Ethnic Studies courses for submission to the CSU-GE review for new Area F courses. The February 5th review date allows the possibility for colleges to begin offering Area F courses in Fall 2021. The next opportunity for review will be in December 2021. Courses approved for CSU-GE at that time would be effective for Fall 2022.

DCCC has heard a concern about the absence of a district-level process for identifying courses that are similar in content. For example, courses in COMM and SPEECH have separate designators and numbers, but they meet the same articulation content. DCCC is looking to form a workgroup of faculty to develop a process for making such reviews. This review process for identifying similar courses may either occur at the local or district level. The workgroup will also have to define what a similar course is.

DCCC is requesting that DAS and local Senates review their credit by exam eligibility criteria (which may be published in the college catalog and/or on credit by exam forms), particularly the requirement that students complete 12 units in residence at their college before being eligible to petition for credit by exam. DCCC recommends that the eligibility restriction is removed because:

- there is no Title 5 or Board language requiring completion of 12 units,
- existing language/requirements exist to ensure that credit by exam is not improperly used to meet residency requirements in Title 5,
- and the practice is inequitable considering the other alternative methods of awarding credit our colleges allow.

DCCC recommends that Board Policy 7241 is amended to allow C- grades from other institutions to count for local major requirements if such grades were applicable towards a major from another college. As this is a request to change Board Policy, this proposal will come to DAS for a first reading at our next meeting.

ATTACHMENT E:

DAS Leadership Meeting with King & Nye

Tues Feb 2, 2021

Debrief of Collegiality in Action

Positives

- appreciated everyone being there to hear the same message from outside authorities
- primer for new BOT members it was good
- appreciated legal review of AB1725
- valuable, informative, appreciated BOT being there and the support from the LRCCD for hosting the session
- good session

Negatives

- small groups would have been great but understood Brown Act limitations
- most of conversation about relationship between DAS and BOT but DAS relationship with the BOT is really with LRCCD administration
- frustration with scenario which was really similar to recent college issue
- frustrated with praise of LRCCD while not acknowledging the problems
- none of LRCCD issues were addressed in the session
- ultimately a 'slap down' on DAS and faculty
- scenarios felt like they were all ending with admin being on wrong side of the situation

Next Steps

- would like to see this type of session more frequently scheduled especially with new people coming into leadership positions
- how to create more engagement between DAS and BOT? how to bring our thoughts to the BOT? direct communication with the BOT would be a big no-no
- need clarification on how local college admin fit into the picture
- follow up meeting in the future would be useful
- should do a post-mortem on some recent events regarding "10+1"
- have a "10+1" mark-up meeting to clarify areas of purview to gain more mutual understanding
- discussions about past decisions may be a useful exercise for all

Other

- when DAS feels position isn't being heard by admin then there is discomfort; people are frustrated because they feel their points were not heard or understood during decision making
- mutual agreement but not really because BOT has the ultimate say; so what is the motivation for any good faith discussion when one side knows they can get their way no matter what
- appreciate honesty of this debrief
- decisions locally come down to an absurd power play and who gets to make the call
- reasons shouldn't be based on 'who can'; should be collectively the best decision for students
- folks don't care about process if they get their way, reverse if they don't get their way
- people may understand and hear, but a decision has to be made which some may not like
- unliked outcomes are not always cases of a lack of collegial consultation
- at the end of the day a decision has to be made which someone may not agree with
- faculty understand that we won't always get our way, we want to be heard
- frustrated when process is not followed but admin say 'yes' it is being followed
- faculty are very knowledgeable people with much more experience which isn't heard
- admin turnover is high, so making decisions is challenging when those dealing the decision are those who are left behind after the admin leaves
- legally BOT and DAS have the relationship, not local senates
- 'heard' vs 'heard and affirmed' is hard
- our struggles are amplified by being a multi-college district
- glad frustrations are being shared in this meeting and hope it continues to be a place to share

Conversation regarding the draft document for Reopening

- Chancellor's Cabinet as a steering group for reopening, unclear how to consult effectively in that space; don't feel heard at Cabinet; no validation that input will be considered or reflected on as the process moves forward; things are being said with no real consequence
- goal of VP team was to gain a broad scope of the issues, create a rough framework to work on moving forward; need everyone in the room (union, senate, admin, etc.) to ensure hearing from everyone
- would like Cabinet meetings to have more on the agenda about what we need to follow up with for meetings
- agreed we need more direction for what Cabinet will focus on for each reopening session
- need to talk through items which are negotiable vs non-negotiable to know what to focus on at Cabinet
- have parameters for what is up for discussion and clarity on who makes the recommendation for items
- framework for 15 essential programs was made and operationalized with the on-the-ground experts (faculty, admin, classified); specific planning will happen at colleges eventually once Cabinet work is done; reopening is a difficult topic
- clarity needed on DE addendum status for summer and fall
- everyone has roles on the Cabinet with a variety of expertise; need to identify stakeholder responsibilities for senate, what are Academic Senate's main items to focus on for reopening?
- large meeting is limiting for collegial consultation or meaningful dialog, but not the only place where consultation happens
- feedback from stakeholder groups is through the Cabinet at the district level per policy; not all expertise on the Cabinet
- need constructive criticism on the draft plan in order to move forward
- negotiated items need space to discuss outside of Cabinet
- motivations are coming from a good place and we need to extend grace to one another; decisions in the near term will not be universally celebrated