



## ASSOCIATED STUDENT BODY

### Student Senate

Meeting Agenda

**03/13/2026**

Location: Board Room

**10:30 AM-12:00 PM PDT**

*Posted by : Soraya Amin, Student Senate President*

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Associated Student Body Senate will hold a meeting on **03/13/2026**. The location and meeting time is noted above. All Associated Student Body Senate meetings are held in locations that are wheelchair accessible. Other disability-related accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities upon request. Persons requesting such accommodations should notify ASB Senate President Soraya Amin at [sorayaamin.asbarc@gmail.com](mailto:sorayaamin.asbarc@gmail.com) no less than two days prior to the meeting. Efforts will be made to meet requests made after such a date, if possible.

### Indigenous Land Use Statement

We acknowledge the land which we occupy today as the traditional home of the Nisenan, 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 Nisenan, Maidu, and Miwok continue as vibrant and resilient tribes and bands, both Federally recognized and unrecognized. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the generations that have gone before as well as the present-day Nisenan, Maidu, and Miwok people.

**I. Call to Order** **1 minute**

**II. Request for Remote Participation:** **1 minute**

*The Student Senate will consider member requests for remote participation under the provisions of [California Assembly Bill 2449](#).*

**III. Roll Call** **1 minute**

**IV. Adoption of the Agenda** **1 minute**

**V. Approval of the Minutes** **1 minute**

**VI. Chair's Message** **5 minutes**

**VII. Advisor's Message** **5 minutes**

**VIII. Public Comment** **5 minutes**

This time is reserved for members of the public to address ASB Senate on issues not already appearing on the agenda. A limit of two (2) minutes per speaker shall be observed, with a maximum of four (4) minutes per topic. No discussion is allotted on public comment. The law does not permit any action to be taken, nor extended discussion of any items not on the agenda. The ASB Senate may briefly respond to statements made for questions posed, however, for further information, please contact the ASB Senate President for the item of discussion to be placed on a future agenda. (Brown Act §54954.3(b))

**IX. Appointments/Swearing-In** **2 minutes**

This time will be reserved for the appointment and swearing-in of current members to ASB Senate and/or committees.

**X. Unfinished Business** **0 minutes**

**XI. New Business**

● **11.1 AI Task Force Feedback** **15 minutes**

This time is reserved to review and discuss the [AI Task Force Draft](#), gather feedback from members, and identify any questions, concerns, or recommended revisions.

● **11.2 Elections Committee** **5 minutes**

This time is reserved to discuss planning for the upcoming elections, including outreach, marketing strategies, and promotional efforts to encourage student participation.

● **11.3 Lobby Day Recap** **10 minutes**

This time is reserved to reflect on the overall experience of Lobby Day, discuss highlights and key takeaways, and gather feedback from attendees. Members are to review what went well, what challenges came up, and what could be improved for future advocacy events and legislative visits.

● **11.4 Welcome to Finals Week** **5 minutes**

This time is reserved to discuss and take action on Bill [S26-09](#) Welcome to Finals Week, which would allocate up to \$10,000 for finals week events for students to

build their own survival kits, register to vote for the June CA Primary Elections, and get to know the 2026-27 ASB Boards.

**XII. Committee Reports**

**5 minutes**

This time is reserved for committee chairs to provide the board with a brief report on the current standing of active committees.

**XIII. Board Member Reports/Announcements**

**10 minutes**

This time is reserved for board members to inform the board about relevant campus-wide events, and to report any pertinent committee progress/activities. A time of three (3) minutes per report shall be observed.

**XIV. SSCCC & Region 2 Updates**

**3 minutes**

This time is reserved for appointed board members, members of the Student Senate of California Community Colleges (SSCCC) to provide updates about state and regional initiatives.

**XV. Public Comment**

This time is reserved for members of the public to address the ASB Senate on issues not already appearing on the agenda. A limit of two (2) minutes per speaker shall be observed, with a maximum of four (4) minutes per topic. No discussion is allotted on public comment. The law does not permit any action to be taken, nor extended discussion of any items not on the agenda. The ASB Senate may briefly respond to statements made for questions posed, however, for further information, please contact the ASB Senate President for the item of discussion to be placed on a future agenda. (Brown Act §54954.3(b))

**XVI. Adjournment**

Soraya Amin **ASB Senate President**

Brett Sawyer **Advisor**

Los Rios Community College District  
Proposed Artificial Intelligence Guidelines  
Presented by the Artificial Intelligence Task Force of the  
District Equity & Student Success Committee

February 2026 Feedback Draft

Link to [Feedback Form](#) (form closed March 25, 2026)

### **An Invitation to Shared Judgment, Learning, and Responsibility**

Generative artificial intelligence did not enter higher education through a single decision or announcement. It arrived gradually and unevenly, through student work, faculty experimentation, new instructional tools, and everyday questions about learning, authorship, assessment, ethics and fairness. Across the Los Rios Community College District, many of the earliest conversations did not begin with clear positions but with uncertainty: faculty and students pausing to ask what responsible teaching and learning should look like next. This work grew from real instructional questions across the district rather than from a centralized directive.

This document is offered as district-wide guidance. Its purpose is to support professional judgment and pedagogical success at a moment of significant change. It is intentionally designed to be read, interpreted, and adapted by educators within their own disciplines, modalities, and teaching contexts. It is not an enforceable policy. It does not prescribe uniform instructional practices, mandate specific tools, or alter existing academic integrity or student conduct processes.

This guidance is grounded in respect for professional judgment. Educators are professionals who make thoughtful instructional decisions grounded in disciplinary expertise, modality, student populations, and course goals. Accordingly, the document is intended to function as a thinking guide rather than a rulebook—something a faculty member can read and reasonably conclude, “This belongs to me to decipher.” (or “this guidance helps me make decisions about my teaching practice.”)

Rather than centering suspicion about student behavior or enforcement, this framework emphasizes clarity, reflection, and learning design. Research and lived experience alike suggest that academic integrity is strongest when expectations are explicit, support is visible, and students experience themselves as part of a learning community rather than as subjects of monitoring. For this reason, the guidance prioritizes AI literacy, transparency, reflective practice, and pedagogical clarity as foundations for ethical academic behavior. The goal is enlightenment over enforcement, growth over “gotcha,” and instructional success over reaction.

#### ***A Brief History of AI-related work at LRCCD***

**2023:** Faculty across disciplines began raising concerns about generative AI’s impact on student learning, authorship, and assessment, alongside growing skepticism about detection-only responses.

**2024:** Campus-based and district-wide conversations expanded to include instructional designers, distance education and learning-management coordinators, educational technology specialists, student conduct professionals, and faculty governance leaders. At the same time, statewide dialogue intensified

as California Community College initiatives—such as Vision 2030 and AI Fellow programs—framed AI as a pedagogical and equity issue rather than a purely technical one.

**2025:** *The District Education and Student Success Committee (DESSC) convened a formal Artificial Intelligence Workgroup with representation from all four colleges and the district. Participants included faculty from multiple disciplines, Academic Senate leadership, instructional and distance education leaders, student conduct and academic integrity officers, student representatives, LRCFT leadership, campus-based AI leads and fellows, and faculty serving as state-level CCC AI Fellows and Changemakers. Faculty-led research, surveys, briefings, and ongoing discussions shaped the work iteratively.*

*Throughout this period, the process remained transparent, lateral, and collaborative. Input came from faculty, students, classified senates, instructional and student services professionals, campus AI leaders, and statewide faculty initiatives, among others. These perspectives are acknowledged as representative rather than exhaustive. Across varied perspectives, a shared commitment to learning, fairness, and institutional integrity remained constant.*

This guidance is grounded in the understanding that belonging is central to integrity. Students are more likely to act ethically when expectations are clear, learning processes are visible, and human support is accessible. Faculty are more likely to succeed pedagogically when their expertise is trusted and when guidance respects academic freedom and shared governance.

Therefore, this intentional, learner-centered approach aims to support:

- pedagogical clarity over prohibition
- transparency over surveillance
- reflection over punishment
- faculty expertise over centralized control

It affirms existing academic integrity standards, codes of conduct, and due-process protections without expanding or replacing them. It does not introduce new enforcement mechanisms, mandate technologies, or prescribe assessment practices. Faculty must retain autonomy over curriculum, syllabus language, and instructional design; colleges retain discretion to adapt guidance to local context and capacity.

This guidance is deliberately adaptive, intended to evolve alongside teaching practice, research, and technological change. It reflects a moment in an ongoing conversation rather than a definitive answer. As technologies evolve and teaching practices continue to change, the framework invites continued dialogue, reflection, and shared learning across the district.

Above all, it invites educators and students to see themselves not as adversaries navigating rules, but as partners in learning, engaged in mutual responsibility, professional judgment, and the collective work of education in a changing world.

## **Best or Effective Practice Recommendations for Students**

Our framework encourages students to:

- A. Recognize the impact that generative AI tools have on your educational experience. We encourage our students to cultivate digital literacy and to use AI ethically and responsibly.
- B. Prompt your professor first. Whatever assistance you might seek from AI, ask your professor first! Your professors are here to help you learn and grow academically.
- C. Honor your incredible abilities and your voice; do not let AI—or anything else—diminish your voice or replace your thinking.
- D. Carefully review AI-related expectations and guidelines for every course, as AI guidelines and rules for usage vary across courses and disciplines.
- E. Maintain your academic integrity by citing AI usage.

## **Best or Effective Practice Recommendations for Faculty**

Our framework encourages faculty to:

- F. Develop and model AI literacy—the ability to understand, evaluate, and discuss how generative AI functions, its limitations and biases, and how it shapes information, creativity, and authorship in academic and civic contexts.
- G. Articulate clear AI-related expectations and agreements in syllabi and class discussions, clearly stating:
  - a. Expectations for ethical, honest, and responsible use of AI in coursework, research, and assessments.
  - b. Prohibited AI-related misconduct, such as unauthorized AI-generated submissions, plagiarism, and misrepresentation.
  - c. Encouragement of transparency and reflection when using AI in learning activities.
  - d. Alignment to Los Rios academic integrity values: honesty, fairness, respect, and responsibility.
- H. Use AI tools pedagogically as aids for critical thinking and creativity, not as shortcuts to outcomes.
- I. Foster student self-reflection on AI use to support learning and integrity.
- J. Stay up-to-date on evolving district/regional AI guidance through professional development activities and Communities of Practice to ensure compliance and innovation.

## **General Guidance for Equitable and Inclusive AI Practices**

Colleges shall consider:

- A. Integrating AI literacy initiatives for both students and employees to build understanding of what generative AI is, how it functions, and how to evaluate its reliability, bias, and ethical implications.
- B. Embedding AI literacy outcomes into orientation, instructional design, and faculty professional learning so that all members of the district community can engage critically and responsibly with evolving technologies.
- C. Opt-out options when possible and guarantee reliable human support for AI issues, per the Vision 2030 HUMANS framework.

- D. Privacy, algorithmic bias, and accessibility in all AI-supported activities to avoid deepening existing equity gaps (see “Generative AI and the Future of Learning”).

## **1. Criteria for Equitable Access to AI Resources**

District criteria shall ensure:

- A. Universal student/faculty access to approved AI tools and platforms across colleges, regardless of program or resource level.
- B. Comprehensive support structures (e.g., help desks, scheduled workshops, lab environments) for users with varying levels of technological proficiency.
- C. ADA-compliant design and multilingual instructional materials to address language/access diversity.

## **2. Coordinated Professional Development Activities**

A central calendar and resource repository for AI professional development will be maintained district-wide:

- A. Colleges will share workshops, webinars, resource materials, and training schedules.
- B. Dedicated AI “professional development days” may be included in campus calendars each semester.
- C. Colleges may consider establishing Communities of Practice for AI, which may include:
  - a. Cross-campus faculty/staff AI discussion groups and innovation teams; these may meet virtually or in person.
  - b. CoPs should be inclusive and encourage sharing so that lessons learned, syllabus language, and classroom approaches are collaboratively refined.
  - c. CoPs can be initiated by department faculty or district offices, following an adopt/adapt structure as needed.

## **3. Guiding Principles for AI Technology Selection**

AI Technologies under consideration by a college or the district should:

- A. Demonstrate compliance with ethical, bias-reducing, and student safety standards outlined in Vision 2030 and the “HUMANS” framework.
- B. Consider open-source or public-benefit design where feasible, with local control and minimal proprietary risk.
- C. Voluntary Product Accessibility Templates, or VPATs, should be provided by vendors and reviewed prior to the adoption of AI technologies.
- D. Prioritize energy efficiency and minimal environmental footprint.

## **4. Academic Integrity and the Use of Detection Tools**

To support academic integrity and promote pedagogical solutions over surveillance and punishment, faculty and colleges are encouraged to:

- A. Design assessments that emphasize process, reflection, and discipline-specific thinking, reducing temptation and opportunity for unauthorized AI use.

- B. Treat AI detection tools as one limited indicator among many, given error rates and potential inequitable impacts on certain student populations.
- C. Utilize multiple forms of evidence when concerns arise (e.g., process artifacts, source quality, inconsistencies, fabricated citations/hallucinations, mismatches with prior work).
- D. Engage students directly and non-accusatorially when concerns arise, recognizing that suspected violations may reflect gaps in AI literacy rather than intentional misconduct.
- E. Develop consistent guidance on documentation (including student dialogue and corroborating evidence) and thresholds for referral before escalating cases through disciplinary processes.
- F. When appropriate, favor developmental responses aligned with conduct policies and the view that accountability can support learning.

## 5. Framework for AI Resource Allocation and Support

To responsibly and effectively implement AI across colleges, institutions must align human, financial, technological, and learning support resources within a coordinated framework. This framework centers on equitable access, ethical use, and sustained capacity-building across the college community.

Colleges should:

- A. Emphasize a human-in-the-loop approach, ensuring that AI enhances—rather than replaces—human judgment, relationships, and decision-making.
- B. Prioritize resources that support equitable and inclusive AI pedagogy and practices, with intentional attention to closing digital access gaps.
- C. Invest time and funding to build AI literacy and ethical competency among students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- D. Strengthen network infrastructure and privacy-safe data storage systems to securely support AI tools and platforms.
- E. Expand device lending programs and technology access initiatives to ensure all students and faculty can meaningfully engage with AI-enhanced learning.
- F. Provide ongoing professional development funding, innovation grants, and structured training opportunities to support faculty experimentation and responsible integration of AI into curriculum and instruction.
- G. Conduct annual technology audits and regular needs assessments to evaluate infrastructure readiness, access gaps, and emerging resource demands.
- H. Develop shared resource systems and coordinated leadership structures, such as a designated AI Coordinator or a cross-college collaborative working group, to guide implementation, share best practices, and maintain alignment with institutional values.

Together, these coordinated investments ensure that AI integration remains ethical, inclusive, sustainable, and aligned with the college's educational mission.

## Works Cited

Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 53200 - Definitions. *Barclay's California Code of Regulations*. 2026.

California Community Colleges. "Vision 2030: The July 2025 Edition."

[www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf](http://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf).

Accessed 12 Aug. 2025.

"DESSC Artificial Intelligence (AI) Workgroup Charter." Los Rios Community College District Equity and Student Success Committee.

[docs.google.com/document/d/1SQ6bTKNyNwDLnfDRfPuM08IQ0V0AFfXtQI7qUqv5qh/edit?tab=t.0](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SQ6bTKNyNwDLnfDRfPuM08IQ0V0AFfXtQI7qUqv5qh/edit?tab=t.0). Accessed 10 Sept. 2025.

"Generative AI and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Report to the Board of Governors." California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

[www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/generative-ai-and-the-future-of-teaching-and-learning-7-17-24-2-a11y.pdf?la=en&hash=A1F4CFBCB27D83D2A0737E4645D3B2FE8C6BF539F](http://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/generative-ai-and-the-future-of-teaching-and-learning-7-17-24-2-a11y.pdf?la=en&hash=A1F4CFBCB27D83D2A0737E4645D3B2FE8C6BF539F). Accessed. 12 Aug. 2025.

Los Rios Community College District, R-2441, *Standards of Conduct*, Oct. 28, 2019,

<https://losrios.edu/shared/doc/board/regulations/R-2441.pdf>.

"Plagiarism and Cheating." *Los Rios Community College District*,

[losrios.edu/about-los-rios/our-values/student-rights-and-responsibilities/plagiarism-and-cheating](http://losrios.edu/about-los-rios/our-values/student-rights-and-responsibilities/plagiarism-and-cheating). Accessed 24 Oct. 2025.

**Note:** The goal of this framework is to advance the foundation AI platform for Los Rios from both district and local Academic Senate perspectives. Our DESSC AI Guidelines Task Force charge, as well as the missions of the Los Rios Community College District and its four colleges, were uploaded to *Claude* (Anthropic) to generate a draft framework. This initial draft framework was extensively reviewed, modified, revised and vetted by the AI Task Force.

#### **AI Task Force Members:**

Soraya Amin, ARC Student; Darius Nesva, FLC Student; Kylee Hilvers, SCC Student, Michael Angelone, ARC faculty; Norman Lorenz, SCC faculty; Andre Coleman, SCC Student Conduct Officer; Miesha Williams, FLC Student Conduct Officer; Steven Roberson, ARC Student Conduct Officer; Morgan Murphy Co-Chair, Education Technology Committee; Kandace Knudson SCC Learning Management System Coordinator; Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, Associate Vice Chancellor, Educational Services & Student Success; Dyanne Marte ARC Faculty; Elizabeth Coleman, ARC faculty; Rochelle Perez, CRC Faculty; Suha Al Juboori, FLC Faculty & CCCCO AI Fellow; Tadael Emiru, CRC Vice President of Student Services; Paula Cardwell, District Academic Senate President.

