

**DRAFT District Academic Senate Meeting - Minutes**

Tuesday, January 18, 2022  
3-5 pm

**Members Present (X = present)**

Julie Oliver	CRC	District Academic Senate President	X
Alice Dieli	ARC	District Academic Senate Secretary	X
Alisa Shubb	ARC	Academic Senate President	X
Corina Hoffpauir	ARC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Amy Gaudard	ARC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Tressa Tabares	ARC	Academic Senate Past President	X
Scott Crosier	CRC	Academic Senate President	X
Lisa-Marie Mederos	CRC	Academic Senate Vice President	
Jacob Velasquez	CRC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Greg Beyrer	CRC	Academic Senate Past-President	X
Eric Wada	FLC	Academic Senate President	X
Danielle Beck	FLC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Lisa Danner	FLC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Paula Cardwell	FLC	Academic Senate Past President	X
Lori Petite	SCC	Academic Senate President	X
Sandra Guzman	SCC	Academic Senate Vice President	X
Amy Strimling	SCC	Academic Senate Secretary	X
Troy Myers	SCC	Academic Senate Past President	X
Andi Hicks	FLC	District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC)	X
Jena Trench	CRC	District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)	
Bernadette Anayah	FLC	District Equity & Student Services Committee (DESSC)	X
Jason Newman	CRC	Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT)	

**Guests:**

Nicole Manker

**Preliminaries**

- Call to order 3:04 PM
- Land Acknowledgement [listed at end of agenda]
- Welcome

**Public Comment (up to 3 minutes per person as time permits)**

The public may comment on any items within the DAS's jurisdiction, even if the items are not on the agenda, only during this portion of the meeting. However, the law prohibits action by the DAS on non-

*California Title 5 §53200 "10+1" 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites 2. Degree and certificate requirements 3. Grading policies 4. Educational program development 5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success 6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles 7. Faculty roles and involvement in the accreditation process 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities 9. Processes for program review 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.*

agenda items. Speakers are limited to up to three minutes. If you wish to speak to a particular item on the current DAS agenda, your comments will be taken up at the time the DAS takes up that item.

One comment from Lori Petite

### **Consent Considerations**

A member of the DAS may request that an item be removed for further discussion and separate action.

- DAS January 18, 2022, Agenda approved
- Adoption of Findings Related to Public Meetings Pursuant to AB 361: passed unanimously with roll call vote

### **BACKGROUND:**

On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361, which amended the Brown Act to provide local legislative bodies the ability to conduct virtual meetings under certain circumstances. The legislation included an urgency clause, which made it effective immediately.

AB 361 allows local legislative bodies to conduct virtual meetings during a state of emergency proclaimed by the Governor under certain conditions, including when “state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing.”

If the state of emergency is ongoing, the local legislative body must adopt certain findings by majority vote every thirty days in order to continue using the virtual meeting rules under AB 361.

On January 6, 2022, the Sacramento County Public Health Officer issued an order “Directing all Public Meetings in the County to Occur Virtually Until Further Notice and Encouraging Workplaces to Conduct Meetings Remotely as Business Needs Permit,” which provides in part:

“All public boards, councils, commissions, and other similar bodies shall suspend in-person public meetings and conduct all meetings virtually. Affected bodies shall ensure opportunities for virtual public participation and compliance with the Brown Act and other relevant statutes.”

The stated purpose of the January 6, 2022 Public Health Order is to “control and reduce the rate of community spread and to reinforce the need for safe interactions.” The Order notes that “in addition to existing COVID-19 mitigation measures, including vaccination and face coverings, additional actions can help limit the likelihood of COVID-19 transmission in workplaces and public settings.”

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Consistent with the Sacramento County Public Health Officer’s Order dated January 6, 2022, it is recommended that the District Academic Senate (DAS) adopt the finding “that state or local officials continue to impose or recommend social distancing measures.”

### **Approval of Minutes (removed from Consent Considerations)**

- DAS December 7, 2021, Minutes – considered separately, approved with 2 edits

### **DAS President’s Report & Other Critical Reports (none)**

### **Decision Item**

## **DAS Constitution & Bylaws**

a. Discussion of the DAS Constitution and Bylaws for possible revision and clarification.

**i. Decision Making-voting, consensus, etc.**

Initial discussion included a number of options for consideration including:

- What is the DAS decision-making process: strict vote, consensus, or a combination with a time limit for reaching consensus?
- How is consensus defined at each college and at DAS?
- If consensus is a good model, does it take too much time to achieve?
- Consideration of the value of having DAS speak with one voice.
- Considering unity of voice with the understanding that the senate is a recommendation body, does consensus without agreement of everyone, in a sense agreeing to disagree, shut down dissent?
- How should votes be allocated: elected members only, include past-presidents, or a combination.
- How should individuals vote: strictly as directed by local senate or with flexibility for consideration of new information that may be presented at DAS.
- After decision is reached, what are the responsibilities expectations of communication for each individual moving forward?
- Reference was made to the bylaws - Article 9: Operational Procedures
  - Section 1: The DAS consists of representatives from the Academic Senates of the colleges, and must provide a forum for the expression of concerns from these separate entities. Constituent Academic Senates should expect equality in the deliberative process, and through the DAS be heard as one voice.
- Consider the occasion that through the deliberative process, there will be one voice, even if it is that there is not an agreement on an item, and would that mean that the item is not brought forward?
- The revision could include the process for some items to require consensus and some require a certain number of members from each college be present and then a vote taken with a result based on numbers.
- When considering numbers – what would be the number and if a simple majority was needed, would a tie be broken by the DAS president, assuming the DAS president also has a past president from the same college if other colleges had past presidents voting, so representation was equal?
- After a decision is reached, should all five presidents be speaking before the board if there is not consensus?
- Consensus would be easier with smaller group, and what happened at the last meeting is important because if there is a tie breaker that shows the senate is split and possibly that item should be sent back. So that is a voice not in support of using a tie-breaker vote
- Can a tie-breaker vote can be equitable?
- Can there be consensus at DAS if local senates do not reach consensus?

- The procedural question is again brought up of expectations each local senate has of the executive senate leaders that are sent to DAS to reach consensus.
- It was noted that a proportional argument is not tenable, using the example of the representation of CA v. MT in the US Senate in rather than the number of US representatives for each state.
- The details to guide this process and its various parts is not codified in the bylaws. It was pointed out that there have been three elements of the decision-making process of the DAS brought up in the discussion so far:
  - The deliberation phase, including who decides, how much time can be allocated for the decision-making process, and how many opportunities for deliberation for each question.
  - When a decision is needed, outcome or decision recorded.
  - Once the decision is made, does the DAS speak as one body and how does the process is there continued dissent.
- There was a question if dysfunctionality is indicated in not coming to any decision
- A point was expressed that some academic and professional matters require a decision because of their importance.
- A point was expressed that the DAS needs to come to its own understanding and lay it down in the bylaws

Discussion continued focusing on three phases of decision-making: 1. Deliberation phase, 2. How is decision or outcome recorded, and 3. Individual and group actions after decision is made.

1. Deliberation phase, who, how much time, how many opportunities

- On the question of time frames, suggestion was made that the time frame for making decisions should be agreed to in advance, the process for extending the time should be agreed to, and details should be delineated as to how to consider new information.
- It was expressed that it is important for all members to be present to discuss how to bring things back to the senate, what needs to brought back to DAS, and what is the time frame.
- The question was asked if only people who vote would speak during deliberations? Later, a point was made that information from sources besides those who vote should be heard.
- There was a question of how each college considers proposals brought back or initiated at the local level? Interest was expressed in having local control over local deliberation processes based on local procedures.

2. When a decision is needed, how is the decision or outcome recorded?

- Would the DAS decision result from 16 votes or four votes? What about new information?
- It was expressed that if the interest is to discuss, as is happening currently, there needs to be a simple majority without a tie break option.
- The question is revisited of who are the voting members and what are the expectations from the local senates concerning all members sent to DAS voting as 1 vote or would there be opportunity for different votes?
- A point was made to consider if a tie means no action or no recommendation, does that result in the DAS ceding the decision on the item to the administration?

- It was expressed that having all 16 votes has a value as each member is exercising discretion – all votes are recorded and members of the public will be able to see how each vote was cast.
  - There was a suggestion that maybe past presidents do not vote because of their potential additional responsibility as DAS president.
  - Continuing, another comment was made that past presidents could still provide advice, counsel, and historical knowledge, but not vote so that would remove the unequal representation if one college did not have a past president to vote if they were serving as DAS president.
  - Additional point was made that past presidents are often no longer faculty or able to serve on DAS.
  - There was an observation that possibly when there is a tie, an action doesn't move forward
  - A point was made that all votes matter.
  - It was noted that past presidents serve at the pleasure of president.
  - It was expressed that if any college doesn't have a past president, it puts them at a disadvantage.
  - A comment was made in support for the idea that a lack of majority signals a tie with the result that an action would not move forward.
  - An observation was made that if there were only the three elected representatives voting per college, the bylaws could codify that x number of votes would be needed to *pass* each particular type of action, setting thresholds and eliminating the prospect of a tie vote.
  - An observation was made that removing past president votes won't solve the tie breaking issue, so simple majority is preferred.
3. Once the decision is made, when do DAS members speak as one body and when/how do DAS members continue to dissent
- Once a decision is made, all support it and local can speak up if there is dissent.
  - If the recorded outcome is not unanimous, it is suggested that the report out states the result is not unanimous – not misrepresentation.
  - DAS can reject an item and it is closed – by voting and rejecting it is closed, rather than using consensus to keep working and keep working toward consensus
  - A way to get around that is to be careful what is voted on – eg vote to continue conversation
  - It was noted that LRCCD policy 3212 only speaks to DAS speaking to board not each college.

At the end of this part of the discussion, the DAS president asked that the bylaws codify the process of decision-making, so the DAS president is able to call a vote and follow a process that is codified.

It was noted that discussions have great value, and having a decision-making process provides value for each college and for the DAS.

## ii. DAS President selection and terms

DAS president reviewed current process that rotates the office of the president from college to college. There are two additional processes, both a recall process and reaffirmation process that seems redundant and puts schedules in jeopardy for students, faculty, and department chairs, and suggests eliminating the reaffirmation process.

Discussion included a number of options for consideration including:

- A comment was made in support of eliminating the reaffirmation process citing the negative impact on student schedules.
  - An explanation of the history behind the development of the reaffirmation process was provided and described the need to establish an easy way for someone to leave the position after a year.
  - A comment was made that there should be an effort to make sure incoming president has relevant, recent experience.
  - There was a short conversation of the time frame for assigning the upcoming DAS president with a suggestion to back-up the announcement to fall to permit schedules to be made in a timely fashion to diminish interruption for students, departments, and deans.
  - It was noted that the process is influenced by the local senate election process.
  - It was noted the DAS team is smaller than the local senate exec teams, as it consists of only the president and appointed secretary, along with informal advice and support from past presidents.
- b. Creation of a writing work group to update the document with any decisions made during the meeting.

#### **ACTION**

DAS president asked college senate presidents to submit the name of one faculty each to form a writing work group to update the DAS Constitution and Bylaws based on the discussions concerning decision-making held during this meeting.

#### **Future Events**

- Future DAS meetings
  - Spring 2022 - Feb 1 & 15, Mar 1 & 15, Apr 6 & 20, May 3
- [LRCCD Board of Trustees](#)
  - Regular Meeting Wednesday, February 16, 2022, 5:30 pm, [Meeting Procedures for in-person and online meetings](#)
- [ASCCC events](#) – visit the website for latest events and institutes

#### **Adjournment 4:57 PM**

#### **Los Rios CCD Academic Senate Call to Action**

Approved Tuesday November 17, 2020

The four Los Rios Colleges and the District Academic Senate support the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall 2019 Plenary Resolution “[Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate](#)

[Education in Community Colleges](#)". Specifically, to the following Resolved statements from that resolution:

- denounce racism for its negative psychological, social, educational, and economic effects on human development throughout the lifespan;
- take steps to not only strive for a greater knowledge about and the celebration of diversity but also to support deeper training that reveals the inherent racism embedded in societal institutions in the United States, including the educational system, and asks individuals to examine their personal role in the support of racist structures and the commitment to work to dismantle structural racism; and
- infuse Anti- Racism/No Hate Education in all its activities and professional development opportunities to the degree that doing so is feasible.

To achieve this, our Academic Senates are committed to:

1. Include a discussion of anti-racism/no-hate education on agendas. Remembering that we do not have to have an answer to start a conversation.
2. Prioritize culturally responsive curricular redesign with our curriculum committees.
3. Acknowledge, without assigning blame, that the structure of our colleges houses the biases and prejudices of their founding times. Those biases have privileged some and disadvantaged others, particularly African American and LatinX communities.
4. Prioritize the evaluation of hiring and evaluation processes with an equity lens.
5. Request services from the ASCCC about any of these topics if needed.
6. Evaluate our academic senates and find the voices among our faculties missing in governance. Find ways to empower those voices.
7. Work with our administrations, classified professional colleagues, and students to find constructive ways students can express themselves about structural and historical biases that exist.

### **Land Acknowledgements**

#### [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.”