# District Academic Senate (DAS) Meeting Minutes

**Tuesday, November 1, 2022**

**3:00 -5:00 pm**

<https://lrccd.zoom.us/j/84695861936?pwd=alhnSjMwTTAyRndOL1J0aTZNNHNSdz09>

Meeting ID: 846 9586 1936

Passcode: LosRios

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Campus | Role | Present |
| Alisa Shubb | ARC | District Academic Senate President | x |
| David McCusker | ARC | District Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Carina Hoffpauir | ARC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Brian Knirk | ARC | Academic Senate Vice President | x |
| Veronica Lopez | ARC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Alisa Shubb | 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 |  |
| Paula Cardwell | FLC | Academic Senate Past President | x |
| Sandra Guzman | SCC | Academic Senate President | x |
| Dawna DeMartini | SCC | Academic Senate Vice President | x |
| Amy Strimling | SCC | Academic Senate Secretary | x |
| Lori Petite | SCC | Academic Senate Past President | x |
| Bill Simpson | ARC | District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) | x |
| Morgan Murphy | FLC | District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) | x |
| Ea Edwards | CRC | District Equity & Student Services Committee (DESSC) |  |
| Jason Newman | CRC | Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) | x |
| Kandace Knudson | SCC | Instructional Accessibility Committee | x |
| Georgine Hodgkinson  Kalinda Jones | CRC  FLC | Prison Reentry Education Program Committee (PREPC) | x |
| Tamara Cheshire  Keith Heningburg | FLC  SCC | Ethnic Studies Faculty Council | x  x |

## Preliminaries

1. Welcome / Call to order

2. [Land Acknowledgement](#land)

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes

5. Introduction on Guests - Craig Davis, Belinda Lum

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

Comment that the conversation between SCC senate and Chancellor King today was not very informative/helpful, that the Chancellor did not fully respond to questions.

7. DAS President’s Report

Attended SCC Senate Meeting. Questions posed to Chancellor were not fully addressed. Chancellor’s description/framing of a cabinet meeting did not match recollections of senators who attended. Comment that Chancellor’s responses were not substantive.

Hiring committee faculty appointments needed for:

* Director of Health & Wellness
* Associate Director of Student Health & Wellness

Faculty appointments needed for Class Size Task Force.

There will be an opportunity to discuss Syncflex classroom technology with Associate Vice Chancellor of IT, Manveer Bola. If you know any faculty who would like to participate, please let the DAS President know.

[Document](https://www.hansonbridgett.com/Publications/articles/220916-4000-ab-2449#:~:text=The%20new%20amendments%20to%20the,on%20individual%20facts%20and%20circumstances) with info about the Brown Act / AB 2449 shared.

Question as to whether we want to address in the bylaws, who chairs DAS if the DAS president is unavailable.

[Google Doc](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZsO_GLzrQdvzgMx6Ezu5wP4kCzqLGfeCWQ-be26r1VA/edit) with info for attending plenary dinner shared.

## Consent Items

(Any member of the DAS may request an item be removed for further discussion and separate action.)

1. Adoption of Findings Related to Public Meetings Pursuant to AB 361: “the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members to meet safely in person.” – Approved by consent.

## Decisions (10-15 minutes per item)

1. Special Admit Students and Dual Enrollment Regulation [(draft R-2212)](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1w-DcaeALpYoH8EuqT8lJLCOc9E8rwyYt/view) (First Reading)

[Current Los Rios Advanced Education Regulations](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-2212.pdf)

[Current Los Rios Dual Enrollment Regulations](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-2218.pdf)

[Proposed Special Admit Students and Dual Enrollment Regulation](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1w-DcaeALpYoH8EuqT8lJLCOc9E8rwyYt/view)

Concerns expressed at FLC senate that there are two separate classes of dual enrollment. Concern around admissions. Concern that faculty not be required to teach things differently if teaching courses with dual enrollment students. Desire for clarity in the regulation. Suggestion that if some of the language that was removed was put back in, it would be clearer.

Jake Knapp’s [response](#knapp) to FLC Questions.

Shared that at ARC, counselors shared concerns about course load and student readiness. No counselors voted to approve the regulation.

Shared that counselors raised concerns at SCC as well about our ability to offer robust support for dual enrollment students.

This item will be coming to Chancellor’s Cabinet on Dec. 12. Desire to have vote in Senate so as to be able to make a clear recommendation.

Inquiry as to whether the support that dual enrollment students might require is a part of this discussion. It’s an important discussion, but perhaps not part of the regulation discussion. May be a future agenda item.

1. [Noncredit Task Group Charge](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qAylsr3QqyY-XSO15_QsTDLNwb4LaCFdGruqWuXs2_o/edit?usp=sharing) (First Reading)

Do we want to charge a group of people with doing this work?

Suggestion that charge should also explore organizational feasibility. Would LRCFT/District support implementation of noncredit courses?

Concern that areas that have been affected by repeatability may not be included in the task group.

Noted that noncredit resolution coming up at ASCCC Plenary.

Concern about noncredit courses possibly putting students from DI populations on a “road to nowhere.”

Shared that at ARC Senate, limited enthusiasm for this charge.

Desire that task group members be open-minded, interested in exploring both the positive and negative.

Inquiry as to whether it would be helpful to have a co-lead for this group.

Suggestion that perhaps someone from LRCFT could be a co-lead.

Inquiry if perhaps someone more neutral should lead the group.

Suggestion that a deliverable in the charge could be a clear presentation of strengths and concerns.

Suggestion that the deliverable could be a set of clear recommendations.

Suggestion that work be free of judgment/bias from District.

## Reports (5 minutes per report + 5 minutes for questions)

1. Los Rios processes for hiring LTTs

[LRCCD Guidelines](https://employees.losrios.edu/lrccd/employee/doc/hr/hiring/guidelines-replacement-faculty.pdf) for Authorizing New and Replacement Faculty Positions

Document with guidelines compiled by Jamey Nye shared.

Suggestion that key question is how are decisions made whether or not to fund these positions.

Question as to whether these guidelines have been followed in the past or if they were created recently in response to our inquiry.

Suggestion that this document be shared with all new Senate Presidents.

Noted that we have hiring manuals for FT and PT faculty and suggested that this document needs the same kind of visibility and transparency. DAS President will discuss with District HR.

Suggestion that LRCFT review the document.

## Discussions (10-15 minutes per item)

1. Los Rios Equivalency Committees processes & regulations

[Current LRCCD Equivalency to Minimum Qualification (R-5123)](https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-5123.pdf)

Los Rios Equivalencies White Paper [Part 1](#eq1)

Los Rios Equivalencies White Paper [Part 2](#eq2)

[Draft](https://lrccd.instructure.com/courses/176134/files/41822395?wrap=1) R-5123 Equivalencies (9/29/21)

Suggestion that we discuss with local senates to explore concerns.

Shared that at ARC senate, there was support for creating a shared process across the district.

Suggestion that we start looking at the draft plan for a district committee.

1. Operationalizing Equity Workgroup rubric for mandatory equity training

[Draft](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OoYLvTMCH7v7JjUnltD9IpXIPXDPogXUXmSHYRGA1B4/edit?usp=sharing) definition of equity training shared.

Equity Training Work Group [Original Report](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UKkauJ9eTcdq4jdUA6gHe6mlut_o224k/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=105543737585314241560&rtpof=true&sd=true)

Suggested that responses could help inform what professional development opportunities are available.

Shared a desire that we use the phrase professional learning, rather than training.

Concern shared that some phrasing may be condescending. e.g “Did you understand…”

Inquiry as to where the form would live.

Shared concern about lack of infrastructure, demands this could put on professional development teams.

Concern if use of this rubric would actually lead to equity. Concern that it focuses on biases and assumptions, overlooks policy. Concern that “how did it make you feel?” may not be a useful question.

Noted that the whiteness inherent in the expectations of the district makes it challenging to create documents that do not center whiteness.

Desire that document inspires authentic reflection.

Desire that this be about authentic reflection, not compliance.

Suggestion that the order of the critical reflections questions be flipped.

Suggestion that we need to consider how those who do not care about equity may need more direction.

Suggestion that document should mention racist policy, not just assumptions and biases.

Suggestion that document may center whiteness by being tailored to those at the beginning of their equity journeys.

1. [ASCCC Fall 2022 Resolutions](https://asccc.org/resolutions-fall-2022) for consideration

Suggestion that not asking for copyright information may devalue OER. Suggestion to amend or vote down 09.01.

Support voiced for resolution 07.07, looking at actual time counselors are available, not at FTE.

Shared that PE faculty have expressed concern about approving CALGETC.

Ask for senators to support 15.04 Establish an Equitable California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE-B) Ethnic Studies Area F Review Process. Concern about departments colonizing Ethnic Studies.

## Items from Colleges for District Academic Senate Consideration

None at this time.

## Committee Reports (as time permits, written reports will be posted to Canvas supporting material section and included in subsequent meeting minutes)

* District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) – *Bill Simpson –* [Report](#dcccc) shared on Canvas

## Upcoming Meetings / Events

* ASCCC Fall Plenary: Thurs, Nov 3rd – Fri Nov 4th Resolution Voting Sat, Nov 5th
* [LRCCD Board of Trustees](https://losrios.edu/about-los-rios/board-of-trustees) Meeting: Wednesday, 9th 5:30pm
* District Academic Senate: Tuesday, Nov 15th 3-5pm
* [ASCCC events](https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events)-events and institutes are listed on the website

## Land Acknowledgements

[ARC Indigenous Land Statement](https://arc.losrios.edu/student-resources/native-american-resource-center#:~:text=We%2520acknowledge%2520the%2520land%2520which,Maidu%252C%2520and%2520Miwok%2520tribal%2520nations.&text=Despite%2520centuries%2520of%2520genocide%2520and,both%2520Federally%2520recognized%2520and%2520unrecognized.)

“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](https://crc.losrios.edu/about-us/our-values/equity-and-diversity/land-acknowledgment)

“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](https://flc.losrios.edu/about-us/our-values)

“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](https://scc.losrios.edu/student-resources/native-american-student-success/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.”

**Supplemental Materials**

Responses to FLC questions on draft R-2212 - Prepared by Jake Knapp.

* **1.2 – Age and Grade Level Limitations on Admission:**Education Code 76000 et seq. establishes admission requirements for special admit students and explicitly identifies age and grade level as factors districts may use for admissions determinations.  The Education Code does not, however, authorize colleges to apply one set of admissions requirements to one group of special admit students and maintain a separate set of admissions requirements for another population of special admit students.

Despite the lack of authority to establish separate admissions requirements for different sets of special admit students, Los Rios has required CCAP participating students to be at least 14 or have started the 9th grade while non-CCAP participating special admit students were required to be 16 or have completed the 10th grade for admission, unless the student appealed.  In addition to the legal compliance issues, it is my understanding that this practice negatively impacted non-CCAP participating students in Middle College High School programs where high schools had MOUs with the District and students are expected to begin attending classes at age 14 or after having started 9th grade.  These students were admitted through an appeal process, placing an extra burden on the student.  Establishing a consistent age and grade level (as proposed, 14 and 9th, respectively) would establish a uniform admission requirement that honors existing MOUs, CCAP and otherwise, and ensures compliance with Education Code.

* **1.3 – 1.4, Safety and Course Content:** see below.
* **1.6 – Limit on Courses:**This section of existing LRCCD regulation is not consistent with state law.Neither title 5 nor the Education Code authorizes a District to limit the number of courses a student may take, except for students on dismissal/probation status – see 5 CCR 58106.  In fact, Education code section 76001 limits the number of units a special part-time student may enroll in at 11 units.  The District has received complaints about the District’s existing regulations in this area, and my office has determined that this specific practice is unenforceable based on 5 CCR 58106(b)(6), (c)(3), and (d).  We have provided guidance to the colleges on student appeals of this practice to reduce our legal exposure until the regulations are amended to comply with state law.  The proposed regulations would bring us into legal compliance in this area.
* **1.7 – PE Limits:** Our team proposed that limits on PE enrollment of special admits be left out of the regulations for brevity and clarity, but will be monitored and enforced for compliance with the law and to ensure eligibility for apportionment. The limit does not substantively impact our dual enrollment process or framework and is more an apportionment/fiscal compliance issue.
* **3.1 – 3.1.3 et seq.** **Basic skills limits:**This section of existing the LRCCD regulation is inconsistent with relevant state law.The Education Code does not allow us to place these restrictions on enrollment (see, for example, CCCCO legal advisory 05-01 and legal opinion 16-02).   These system-office legal opinions support the position that special admit students may enroll in any course for which they meet the prerequisite and any properly established enrollment limitations upon admission to the college.
* **3.2 – Use of transcripts and GPA for admissions:** LRCCD’s existing regulatory language in this area is inconsistent with state law.  It establishes a multiple measures assessment to determine whether a student is eligible for admission to the college using factors outside of those a district is authorized to consider under education code section 76002 (age and grade level).  The Matriculation Act of 1986 and the Seymour Campbell Student Success Act both prohibit colleges from denying admission to a student based on an assessment.  This general concept is also reinforced in legal advisory 05-01, and legal opinions 07-07 (generally in regard to denial of admission based on factors not in EC 76002) and 16-02 (specific to GPA).
* 3.3 – **Use of a GPA for continuing enrollment.**LRCCD’s existing regulations are not compliant with state law.  Education code and title 5 provide no provision that grants the colleges the ability to place more restrictive requirements on continuing special admit students than exist under the probation and dismissal standards.

And a few general responses from our team:

**Course Content:**This language was omitted for simplicity and to mirror how title 5 and Education Code frame dual enrollment requirements. Nothing in the proposed regulations are intended to intrude in any way on a faculty member’s academic freedom.  The intent is that we are not offering special “dual enrollment” classes, but rather special admit students can dually enroll in college classes. Most colleges have adopted onboarding orientations for dual enrolled students that clarifies that they will be taking college classes and often note what the differences are between college and high school classes, their responsibilities as college students, as well as what FERPA requirements mean.

**Health and Safety Issues:**  Faculty may address specific health and safety issues through the curriculum process in establishing enrollment limitations for a course. As an example, a Public Officer Safety Training (POST) where a student would have to handle firearms– course limitations on age would be appropriate.  In general, our interest with the proposed regulations is to provide a framework for our dual enrollment programs.  The proposed regulations do not speak to enrollment limitations that may be adopted for specific courses.  This may be one of the implementation issues we explore after we establish the framework through the new regulatory process.  If possible, I like the idea of establishing the framework rather than over-regulating in specific areas (which can lead to unintended consequences for students and faculty).

**FERPA:**You noted that the new draft does not mention FERPA or at least acknowledge that dually enrolled students must (as is the case for all college students) be able to speak for themselves and are responsible for their work and behavior as in the current regulations.  We removed this in the proposed dual enrollment regulations as this applies to all students and is referenced in other sections of LRCCD regulations. It was omitted for simplicity and redundancy, but we will reconsider if it raises concerns from the Academic Senate.  It is my understanding that our colleges provide information to incoming students about FERPA, especially in new student orientations. In addition, FERPA disclosures are also provided to students annually, as required by law.

**Los Rios Community College District**

**Long-Term Temporary Faculty Positions**

**Information compiled October 2022**

1. **What conditions must exist for an LTT to be hired?** 
   1. A long-term temporary (LTT) faculty member is a person employed in a faculty position that is held by a regular faculty member who is temporarily absent.
   2. When multiple partial leaves and reassignments impact a department’s ability to make load, two or more partial leaves or reassignments may be combined to support an LTT request.
2. **How long can a LTT be hired for?** 
   1. Not more than one year.
   2. An LTT cannot be hired for less than a semester, unless one of these two conditions are met:
      1. An LTT can be hired in part of Fall as long as they are hired for the subsequent Spring.
      2. An LTT can be hired for part of Spring as long as it is before March 15th.
3. **Limits on assignment:**
   1. Must be greater than 67%??
   2. In all cases, the maximum FTE for LTTs in a given year is 50% of the total eligible leaves and reassigned time for each college.
4. **Process to request an LTT**
   1. Long Term Temporary replacement requests shall be reviewed by VP Council, Business and Human Resources.
   2. After VP Council review, send an email to the AVC, Human Resources and Director, General Services.
   3. The requesting VP will ensure the Academic Senate President is advised when there is a request to hire an LTT.
5. **Pay rate** – Paid from Salary Schedule A and placed in same manner as a regular faculty member.

***Guidelines for Authorizing New and Replacement Faculty Positions***

***Revised September 2014***

Text

Description automatically generated

Text

Description automatically generated

Education Code 8741

Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 87478 and 87480, the governing board of a community college district may employ any qualified individual as a temporary faculty member for a complete school year, but not less than one semester or quarter during a school year unless the date of rendering first paid service begins during the second semester or third quarter and prior to March 15th. The employment of these persons shall be based upon the need for additional faculty during a particular semester, quarter, or year because a faculty member has been granted leave for a semester, quarter, or year, or is experiencing long-term illness, and shall be limited, in number of persons so employed, to that need, as determined by the governing board.

Any person employed for one complete school year as a temporary employee shall, if reemployed for the following school year in a vacant faculty position, be classified by the governing board as a contract employee and the previous year’s employment as a temporary employee shall be deemed a year of employment as a contract employee for purposes of acquiring permanent status.

For purposes of this section “vacant position” means a position in which the employee is qualified to serve and which is not filled by a regular or contract employee. It shall not include a position which would be filled by a regular or contract employee except for the fact that such employee is on leave.

*(Amended by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1302, Sec. 82. Effective September 25, 1990.)*

**Los Rios Equivalency Process**

**Part 1**

The minimum qualifications for hiring faculty at California Community Colleges are established statewide by the Board of Governors, and are published by the State Chancellor’s Office in what is known as the *Disciplines List.* Districts are required by state law to use the Disciplines Listwhen identifying the minimum qualifications for new or vacant faculty positions. The only local control over faculty minimum qualifications resides in *equivalency* determinations. Education Code Sections 87359 and 87360 allow districts to hire individuals who do not possess the specific qualifications for service identified on the Disciplines Listif they possess “qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications” as determined by the local district.

Equivalency is an alternative process to determine an applicant’s qualifications for a faculty position. It is meant to be a mechanism to allow qualified candidates to demonstrate that they have attained and possess qualifications that are equivalent to the minimum qualifications to teach within a discipline. For example, a candidate can demonstrate that a master’s degree in a related field is equivalent to those specifically identified on the Disciplines List, or may demonstrate experience by providing evidence of professional training, delivery of instruction in other settings, or receipt of an industry credential or certificate.

If a candidate is granted an equivalency, the individual is merely allowed to enter the pool of qualified candidates for the open faculty position. The candidate would then be on equal footing with other qualified candidates to compete for the position as part of the District’s full and fair hiring process.

Los Rios has an established process for determining equivalencies (see P-5123 and R-5123). In the fall 2020 semester, the District Academic Senate acting jointly with the Chancellor formed a review committee (R-5123, section 13.1) to recommend substantive changes to the District equivalency process to promote consistency in equivalency determinations, equity in the hiring process, and the expansion of qualified applicant pools for District faculty positions.

**REVIEW COMMITTEE CHARGE**

Amend the Los Rios equivalency process to ensure fair, consistent, and equitable outcomes, broaden faculty applicant pools, improve faculty diversity, and eliminate barriers to District employment.

**EXISTING EQUIVALENCY PROCESS**

The current District equivalency process is established in Regulation 5123 (link to text: [https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-5123.pdf](about:blank)). In summary, the process consists of the following:

* **Equivalency Committees:** Each separate faculty hiring committee (or a subset of the committee) is responsible for making equivalency determinations for candidates who have applied for the open faculty position (see R-5123, Section 7.1). In other words, a subset of the very committee making hiring recommendations is tasked with determining whether or not a candidate should be granted an equivalency and allowed to enter the pool of qualified candidates at the beginning of the hiring process. In a robust hiring year, the District may have more than 75 different equivalency committees across the District making equivalency determinations for vacant full-time faculty positions.
* **Effect of Equivalency Determinations:** An applicant receiving a positive equivalency ruling at one college is then considered qualified in that discipline on a District-wide basis. The District has multiple examples of a candidate simultaneously applying for an equivalency at more than one Los Rios college and receiving inconsistent determinations. These candidates were essentially told that they met the minimum qualifications to compete for a position at one college, but were not qualified to compete for the very same position at another college.
* **Consistency of Equivalency Determinations:** R-5123 provides that equivalency committees must “take caution to assure that consistency is applied to all decisions regarding equivalency” and further requires the Area Dean to maintain records of past decisions of equivalency committees and provide copies of those records to new committees “as needed.” At best, this process provides a level of consistency for equivalency determinations within each department at a college, but does not account for consistency between and among our colleges. As noted above, under the current process a positive equivalency determination is effective District-wide.

There are several practical issues with the existing equivalency process identified above. As an initial matter, if the purpose of an equivalency is to allow a candidate into a qualified applicant pool on equal footing with other candidates, it makes little sense to have a subset of a hiring committee make the equivalency determination. Committee members may develop positive or negative impressions of candidates as part of the equivalency process, impressions that other candidates for the same positions do not have an opportunity to make. Again, the granting of an equivalency merely allows a candidate to enter the pool of qualified candidates for the open faculty position. The candidate would then be on equal footing with other qualified candidates to compete for the position as part of the District’s full and fair hiring process.

The sheer number of equivalency committees in the existing process dispersed among our four colleges gives rise to inconsistencies in equivalency determinations. These inconsistencies are especially apparent when an applicant applies for positions at more than one college and receives different results. Under the current system, if an applicant was granted an equivalency at Sacramento City College, but denied an equivalency at Cosumnes River College, the candidate would be allowed into the applicant pool at SCC but may or may not be allowed into the applicant pool at CRC, depending on which college’s equivalency committee made its determination first (since positive equivalency determinations are effective district-wide, if SCC granted the equivalency before CRC denied it, the candidate would be deemed to meet minimum qualifications at CRC as well). This outcome is difficult to defend, as Los Rios is committed to allowing all candidates a full and fair opportunity to obtain employment with the District.

**Los Rios Equivalencies Process**

**Part 2**

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EQUIVALENCY PROCESS**

The review committee met several times during the fall 2020 semester, met with faculty and gathered input from other districts, and explored several options for Los Rios equivalency determinations moving forward. The committee proposes several changes to the Los Rios equivalency process, including the following:

* **One District-Wide Equivalency Committee:** The review committee encourages the formation of one district-wide equivalency committee comprised of the District Academic Senate President, the Academic Senate President from each college (and/or a separate faculty representative from each college) and administrative support as appropriate. The District Equivalency Committee would meet regularly (at least once per month), and more frequently as needed during higher volume recruitment periods. The District Equivalency Committee would receive discipline-specific input and recommendations from the relevant department chairs or designated discipline experts at each college on individual equivalency applications, but the ultimate decision on each equivalency application would be made by the District Equivalency Committee. Other multi-college districts in California, including the Los Angeles Community College District, have adopted a single equivalency committee model. Use of a single District Equivalency Committee would promote consistency and fairness in equivalency determinations.
* **Terms of Equivalency Committee Members:** The review committee proposes that the two-year terms of District Equivalency Committee members be staggered so as to maintain consistency, practical experience, institutional knowledge, and a level of expertise at all times.
* **Training for District Equivalency Committee Members:** One of the benefits of the new District Equivalency Committee is the consistency of membership and the ability to invest in training for the individuals serving in this important role. The review committee believes members of the District Equivalency Committee should receive regular training on the equivalency process, the District faculty hiring process, the educational benefits of workforce diversity, equity in hiring, the importance of broad and robust applicant pools, and the use of eminence in equivalency determinations.
* **Implementation of Committee Decisions:** As the District Equivalency Committee makes determinations on individual equivalency applications, it is expected that certain patterns will emerge and efficiencies will be obtained. For example, new degrees may be produced at colleges and universities (or existing degrees may be re-named), and these degrees may be placed on a standard list of District-approved equivalencies in certain disciplines. Administrative staff in Human Resources working jointly with the District Equivalency Committee may compile a list of previously approved equivalencies that do not require a new and separate determination. Candidates who meet these pre-approved equivalency standards would be automatically placed in the qualified applicant pool without the need for a separate equivalency determination. This will save time for both the Committee and the applicant in question, and will remove one more barrier for candidates who are interested in employment with the District.
* **Clarity for Applicants:** Once the new equivalency process is implemented, the review committee strongly encourages the District to make the equivalency process clear to applicants in the recruitment process and on the District website. The minimum qualification and equivalency process is complicated, and it is important that we make the process as simple and clear as possible for potential applicants so that we do not lose talented candidates who are interested in serving our diverse student population.

**NEXT STEPS**

The review committee will work with both District administration and the District Academic Senate to both demonstrate the need for and implement the proposed changes to the Los Rios equivalency process. Revisions to R-5123 will be proposed in early Spring 2021 and presented to interested constituency groups for feedback. The regulatory revisions will ultimately be presented to the District Academic Senate, the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services, the Chancellor’s Executive Staff, and the Chancellor’s Cabinet for approval. The review committee intends to have a new process approved and implemented by the end of the Spring 2021 semester.

**District Curriculum Coordinating Committee Report**  
The committee met on Oct. 28.  
• All of the curriculum proposals were approved.  
• Socrates now uses the updated language for the distance education section of course   
outlines.   
• Socrates will soon have a public-facing course and program website which Articulation   
Officers will use to share outlines with our transfer partners.  
• DCCC will be forming workgroups to respond to AB 928 (CalGETC), AB 1111 (Common   
Course Numbering), and the new local Ethnic Studies graduation requirement.  
The next DCCC meeting will be held Dec. 2, 2022.  
Respectfully submitted by Bill Simpson, DCCC Chair.