ARC Academic Senate Approved Minutes

October 08, 2026
3:00pm
ARC Student Center Board Room
Meeting ID: 836 2610 4920
Zoom link: Zoom link

Preliminaries

1. Call to Order: Called to order at 3:00
    - Land acknowledgement read by: Alisa Schubb
2. Approval of the Agenda: Agenda Agenda approved by consent
3. Approval of the Minutes: Thursday September 10 approved by consent. Two friendly amendments (one typo corrected and once sentence added to a senator's statement made) and approved with consent for Thursday, Sep 24, 2026
    - We are correcting and approving the meeting notes from Thursday, September 10, 2026
        i. NAGPRA Policy 7910
        ii. Human Remains Policy 7920
    - We approving draft meetings notes from Thursday, September 24, 2026
4. Introduction of Guests:
    - Zoom guests
        i. Valerie Bronstein, English
        ii. Angela Daroy, VPI
        iii. Jen Healey, math department
        iv. Araceli G, ethnic studies
        v. Rebecca Gebo, Dual Enrollment Faculty Coordinator
    - Sarah Lehmann, Library
5. Public Comment Period: (3 minutes per speaker)
    - A senator would like to know if it is possible to have slim tables brought into the board room, for the area where seating furniture is currently only chairs, so people can take notes if they are sitting in the seats that are currently not close to tables. Sarah Lehmann will bring this up with the Operations Council.
    - Amanda Lewis provided a reminder about Homecoming Week October 18-24. Amanda went over the flyer and its schedule.
    - A guest provided the following statement as a public comment: I learned at District Academic Senate that ARC has received a pitch from a small edtech startup called AQL Labs to join an "AI Accelerator" cohort beginning in November

2026. The deadline to apply is tomorrow, and participating would cost $30,000. The materials are in the ARC Senate Canvas. The pitch is that this company will help colleges identify two processes that could be improved with AI, and then help the colleges pilot an AI-based solution for those two processes. The company seems to have just two employees, the founders, both of whom are based out of state. I am not sure how seriously the college is considering this project, but with this timeline, I hope it's a "maybe next year" sort of thing. I have a lot of questions.

i. First, could we simply begin this work on our own without paying a fee? Our talented faculty and staff are already using AI to solve problems. At a recent department chairs meeting Randy Schuster and Tak Auyeung shared how the SLO committee uses AI to identify program SLOs in need of review. We have great local talent as well as robust governance and planning structures - let's not pay to reinvent the wheel.

ii. Second, what is the value to students vs the investment of money and institutional capacity? Our college and district have a history of purchasing expensive edtech tools and educational reform initiatives, investing lots of time and money into them, and then abandoning them. Civitas, AdAstra, and Achieving the Dream come to mind. We have spent millions of dollars and hundreds of hours of staff time on shiny solutions that didn't pan out. We could have spent those resources on the slow and steady and sometimes painful process of working within our governance structures, trudging through college and district bureaucracy, and incrementally improving our institutional practices so we can better support our students. It is not glamorous but there is no substitute for this hard work.

iii. Third, how much would ARC benefit vs how much would this company benefit, and who will ultimately own the work we produce? How will our data be used? Who will receive a share of the profits from any tools the company develops using our information and ideas? AQL Labs has two divisions: the "Foundry," which is what we'd be participating in, and the "Studio," where they help edtech entrepreneurs develop and test new AI tools. The Studio webpage states that AQL Labs will provide entrepreneurs with, quote, "Vital growth supports including pilots and market testing with a growing network of trusted Foundry colleges and universities." Just to be clear, it sounds like we would be the guinea pigs here, and the goal would be to sell our ideas back to us in the form of ai tools that we helped develop.

iv. The final question is what evidence do we have that this company can deliver what it is promising? The only actual work this company seems to have done is an initial pilot project with Long Beach City College. I think we all agree we need to grapple with the impact of AI, but let's take a step back from this specific project.

- A senator from CIS read the results of a particular AI process that he completed in about four hours, looking into Zero Textbook Cost:
  i. Why it matters
     1. ZTC is a sustainability question, and it needs a person
     2. Fall classes started August 22, Pell arrived September 4, day 14.
     3. Roughly 12,000 low-income students: Promise pays fees, not books
  ii. Where we are

1. 27% of fall sections carry the ZTC label
2. Bookstore sample: half of unlabeled sections need tithing to buy. We undercut (underreport the percent of sections that are ZTC)
3. Of sections that require materials, half include something that expires in 120-180 days, which means students lose access to the book they spent money on.
4. A&P: buy twice or pay +$68 for a 2-year code
5. OER students keep it for the next course, the retake, the licensing exam

iii. What we've committed to
1. Title 5 § 54221 (July 2025): first day access, sustainable ZTC degrees
2. Protects our academic freedom to choose materials
3. Chancellor's Office guidance: support it with "faculty time"
4. Our accreditation midterm (August 2026):ARC will "provide the resources"

iv. The economics
1. Coordinator ran on one-time state money, not renewed
2. 0.4FTE = $74K/year, salary plus benefits
3. Each low-income student who returns with aid = $2,200, not capped
4. Break-even 170 students = 1% of Promise students
5. Most conservative: about 1 in 100 low-income students ZTC sections
6. Not proven yet: data requested: The bar is low.

v. The ask
1. Continue the ZTC coordinator at 0.4 on ongoing funds
2. So what we built doesn't expire like an access code

- A senator made the following public comment: On April 10, 2025, this body adopted a resolution in support of trans and nonbinary students and employees. The resolution made several asks of the institution, including that transphobia be named on the college's "types of harassment" webpage and that the website should make it clear how students can report transphobia, intentional misgendering, and deadnaming.
  Yesterday, having heard from a trans student that they were being harassed by another student, I visited the "types of harassment" webpage hoping to find info I could share with the student. The webpage was unchanged. There is still no mention of transphobia or harassment based on gender identity or gender expression.
  According to research published by the Williams Institute in 2022, approximately 59% of trans adults in California have experienced violence or harassment in the past year, 39% of trans adults in higher education experienced bullying, harassment, or assault. LGBTQ people in community college were three times as likely as non-LGBTQ peers to face bullying, harassment, or assault.
  This omission sends a message that is contrary to the message we endeavor to send with things like Homecoming and "You belong." I'm hoping that senate leadership can reintroduce the resolution to the executive leadership team, and if we can support the asks in the resolution or at least have a discussion.

- A senator shared the following concern that was emailed to him by a faculty member: Last year, a handful of faculty and staff in our division had their Adobe licenses revoked, including myself and the staff in my area. I teach with Adobe, as do most in our division, and while this was corrected after a discussion with I.T. and our dean, it was still a midsemester disruption. This semester I had Microsoft licenses deactivated and when I put in a service ticket; I was initially told by Service Central that physical licenses were being revoked for both Microsoft and Adobe due to budget restraints; I have since been told this was a miscommunication, but discussions with my counterparts at CRC and SCC have confirmed that some sort of similar action on other campuses has or will be starting up soon.
  So while it may be a miscommunication now, it is still a concern I think should be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate, as I believe changes to the teaching environment should be discussed with the senate before action is taken. At SCC, an informal question to I.T. revealed that each faculty member will eventually need to specify to their dean which Adobe applications they need for their job, and their access will be limited to those applications in the future. At CRC, faculty were given a survey to fill out last year in order to whittle down who exactly needed physical licenses for Adobe.
  There is concern that if the ARC Academic Senate does not have a plan in place, decisions about our teaching environment could be taken in the future by admin without our explicit input. I just want to add this to a possible discussion.

6. President's Report:
   - ARC Crisis Assessment Support Team (CAST) is looking for instructional faculty representation (this comes with training)
     i. Meets Wednesdays from 9:30-11:00 AM via Zoom.
     ii. New members receive training through the National Association for Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment (NABITA).
   - Faculty Prioritization email - **Requests are due by October 13, 2026**
     i. Fall 2026 Timeline
     ii. Faculty Presentations will be on October 22nd, from 2:30 pm - 5:30 pm
     iii. **Only** Senators will vote
        1. Look at rosters to make sure they are accurate
        2. Senators, check with areas to make sure they are accurately represented.
     iv. Presentation sign-up sheet will be available after Oct 13th
        1. Presenters should share their slides so they can be presented from the AS meeting computer, to avoid technical issues (there were technical issues last year).
   - Parking for Campus Events -
     i. Event organizers should coordinate parking needs with Campus Police in advance.
     ii. Arrangements vary depending on the size and needs of the event and may include a designated parking lot for larger events.
     iii. ASCCC Area A Meeting Friday, October 9th from 9-3 pm

1. Registration link
2. Resolution Packet

- Opportunities for Faculty Committee Participation - Send an interest email to VP Daniel Slutsky

  i. **Program Review Committee** (3rd Mondays, 1-2pm Zoom)

     1. Student Services, VACANT
     2. CE Faculty, VACANT

- **Student Success Council** (2nd and 4th Wednesdays, Hybrid options, 1-3 pm)
  i. Faculty – CTE
  ii. Faculty – Expertise with DI populations
  iii. Faculty – Instructional or Student Services

Consent Items

7. Approval of Remote Attendees
   - Mikhail Drobot (DCDT) 1
   - Christian Speck (Business Adjunct) 3
   - Diane Lui (FAA) 3
   - Shannon Pries (English FT alt) 1
   - Jacqueline Yago (BUS Div FT - Paralegal Studies) A

Decision **(5-10 minutes maximum per item)**

8. Affirm placement of Universal Design Accessibility Coordinator Critical Hire in Fall 2027 Faculty Prioritization (2nd Read)
   - Handout
   - Email sent to ARC Administration
   - April 16, 2026 Minutes, Item 11
   - April 30, 2026 Minutes, Item 11
   - We would still see an application and a presentation by the team about the UDAC position. If we affirm the position, it would automatically go to #1. We're not sure how that would look technology-wise, so we might have to try things out technology-wise. We would either pull the UDAC position from the ranking, or if we agree to affirm the placement as #1 we are agreeing to rank the position as #1. (We don't know what the backside would look like if the body decides to affirm the placement of the position).
     i. A senator asked if we are voting on ranking this position as #1 and the answer given was yes.
     ii. A motion was made to affirm this position as #1 by this body, by VP Daniel Slutsky. A senator seconded the motion.
        1. Additional discussion:
           a. VP Daniel Slutsky reminded the body of the procedure. This is the first time the senate has approved an emergency hire that was not approved by the

administration. If this position is approved by the body in this vote, this position would be taken off the top of the allocation of positions. For example, if we are approved 10 positions and this body decides to approve this position as #1 there would only be 9 positions left.

b. A senator asked if this was already voted on last year, and the answer given was that this was correct, but the administration did not approve this position. Senate recommended this position as a critical hire, but administration recommended that this body go through the process with this position, so this is what we are doing now: affirming our commitment from last spring.
c. Another senator asked for clarification on the steps: in Fall 2025, this position did not rank high enough but in the Spring 2026 this position was voted on by the body
d. Voting in today's meeting: 6 abstentions, 27 yes, 0 no

Reports **(5-10 minutes per item)**

9. Curriculum Updates
   Proposal to revise the LRCCD Emergency Closure Distance Education addendum. One change was suggested, namely to revise the ambiguous phrase about mutual agreement into a stand-alone sentence. DCCC asked Chairs to present this to our local committees. ARC's Committee had two questions:

- Does the Senate want agreement on closing the campus or on moving to DE? Does this body want to move forward with including language in the addendum that includes consulting with the Academic Senate before moving courses online, in the event of an emergency DE (this could be for a specified amount of time while the emergency is occurring. Should this be mutually agreed upon?
    - Senators asked for clarification on mutual agreement. Alisa Shubb shared that this means there is an actual mutual agreement between administration and Academic Senate to move forward. Without mutual agreement, things stay the same and nothing moves forward. This is different from relying primarily on Academic Senate, which means administration can move forward without agreement between administration and Academic Senate. With mutual agreement there are instances such as financial costs which would also allow administration to move forward without senate agreement.
    - A senator asked questions about logistics about moving classes online- is it an all or nothing thing? The answer that was provided indicated that this would not need to be an all or nothing thing, and that instructors could be given options. There was also a reminder that any time an emergency comes up, there will be complications. This is a matter of whether faculty should be included in the decision made to move to online instruction in an emergency situation.
    - A senator noted that if this decision falls completely on one person (Academic Senate President, who may get a late-night call that needs to be responded to

immediately) a document should be drafted to help the Academic Senate President make that decision.

- A senator pointed out that at the heart of this is the question about whether the "emergency" is actually an emergency (for example, last semester we were told we could not come to campus because of an internet outage, but the sports teams were still allowed to come to campus to practice). The clarification on what is being asked is the DE step between declaration of emergency - go to Academic Senate- academic senate will work to find mutual agreement on the decision to go online. This is on every curriculum.
- Another senator pointed out that the status quo is that administration can unilaterally decide whether the situation is an emergency. What we are discussing here is whether to add Senate into the conversation … A senator mentioned that for some students, their only online access is on campus, and it is expensive for part time faculty to buy laptops and document cameras to allow them to teach remotely from home. This is an equity issue.

10. Hiring Manual Updates- President and Past President met with the group last Friday, slowly making progress.
11. Council Updates
    - Institutional Effectiveness Council - (Dr. Connie Ayala)
        i. Written Report
    - Operations Council - (Sarah Lehman)- no update because they are meeting next week.
    - Student Success Council - (Caitlin Zumalt)
        i. Written Report

Discussion **(10-15 minutes per item)**

12. Resolutions on Timelines and Equity-Centered Milestones for Faculty Staffing and Hiring Processes Chemistry, biology, and physics all had problems with hiring. Questions asked were: is HR keeping the same pool? What happens before the pool is released? A lot of emergency hires were needed last year. What is the process? What is the timeline? Can we come to an agreement about the timeline so faculty can do what they need to do to get people in place. Another question that came up is whether we should specify the adjunct highlight process in the document? The departments met last Friday and had a discussion. Some of the topics talked about were:
    - Pre-req issues
        i. Counseling is passing off student prereq checks to department chairs/faculty (and they should stop)
        ii. Even if IT added a pop-up window during student registration notifying students that they have a course in their cart that has prereq requirements, it would help. IT not addressing prereqs at all isn't working.
    - Testing center
        i. Would be nice to have dedicated space and assigned IA, or use 3rd party testing center, to administer tests for "partially online" classes
        ii. Current plan for next semester seems to be to wait and see what rooms

will be available...makes it hard to give advanced notice to students...

- Hiring Issues
    i. Gaining access to applicant/adjunct pools (from district) seems harder than it ever used to be, with an increase in the number of steps now required before we can look at the pool
    ii. Screening seemed to be the hold-up for Bio (district level)
    iii. District seems to want to open a new pool each time
    iv. Strategy from dean seems to be emergency hires; that's not working
    v. Issues faced by new Chem hires in F26 - no w#'s, can't access roster, email, or Canvas to send out prereq communication, no keys to access work spaces, overall large negative effect on both students and faculty
    vi. Bio issues - fully enrolled classes cancelled

- Budget Clarity
    i. Division/department budgets are a black box under control of Munaf... From the LRCFT Contract, Department chair duties include:
    ii. 2.2.4.3.7 Advising and assisting in the preparation of departmental proposals or requests relating to department budgeting
    iii. 2.2.4.3.11 Facilitating the ordering of instructional materials for the department, such as textbooks, films, and other items that augment the instructional program (not to be interpreted as overriding the academic freedom of individual faculty members to order instructional materials for their own classes)
    iv. Would like more collegial cooperation/dialogue regarding the use (or even amount) of funds being spent and on what purchases

The departments decided to work on a resolution that could be presented to the Academic Senate regarding the hiring issues faced by the departments represented on Friday.

- There were some suggestions for changing the wording on the document, and most likely this won't come back until November's meeting.
- A senator noted that there were 12 emergency hires this semester in ESL. ESL is in support of this resolution. It is difficult to hire when the process is drawn out, and other campuses are hiring.
- Another senator noted that hiring temporary staff has been a drawn-out process. Courses have had to be moved into future semesters as a response to the slow hiring process for temporary hiring, since before COVID. This has been brought up to one of the board members. This is also an issue when hiring students into positions. Many students who are eligible for federal work study have not been able to use their federal work study to be hired into the position and be offered hours. The VPI Angela Daroy mentioned that student hiring is separate, but also a concern. This resolution focuses on faculty. There is a shared Google document tracking experiences that all of the campuses have had with HR, so issues can be brought up in an upcoming meeting (no meeting is scheduled yet).
- There is a request for suggestions on how to fill in bullets with question marks (noted, in the document attached above).
- A suggestion was made that in the 4th Resolve referencing the contract: move whereas arguments in the whereas section to create a cleaner resolve and include in the request that we try to avoid summer hires into another one of the resolves.

- VPI Angela Daroy would like to help identify campus-specific slow-downs vs. district slow-downs, in hiring.

13. Academic Integrity in the Age of AI: What Support Do Faculty Need?
    - ASCCC Resolution (Testing Centers): Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence
        i. Would this body like to write a resolution to add a testing center to our campus? Folsom Lake College uses its former bookstore as a testing center.
        ii. A senator brought up a specific section in the document: "Whereas, Universal testing centers at California Community Colleges would not only support the integrity and transferability of distance education courses, programs, and degrees, but would also expand access to on-site tutoring and academic support services for non-local students, thereby advancing both academic quality and student success outcomes systemwide." The senator indicated that our priority should be local students.
        iii. A senator shared a concern about tutors being asked to be exam proctors. It was noted that using tutors as exam proctors has not been a suggestion that has been brought up, but this is noted.
    - ARC AI Senate Standing Committee Working Document
    - AQL Labs - AI Implementation Accelerator and shared slides from Long Beach City College
        i. ARC President Lisa Cardoza has indicated that the focus will be on administrative and operational use purposes.
        ii. Calbright, Long Beach City College, and Merced College have partnered with AQL Labs.
        iii. AQL Labs is a for-profit company with funding through Futures Foundation. Senators are not familiar with this company.
            1. It was pointed out that this was not presented formally to the Academic Senate or the college through the Executive Leadership Team. It was sent by the college president to individual faculty before it came to Academic Senate.
            2. A question was asked whether this body has any say over whether money will be spent on this. The answer was given that this is apparently going to the district now.
            3. The guest who made the public comment on this topic had questions about the process, where the funding is coming from, and pointed out that this company is currently testing its products. It is a start-up. A request was made to shop around to find other companies that provide services the college/district need.
            4. A question asked was about what is driving this interest, and there is a concern that we are being taken advantage of in this deal.
            5. A senator pointed out that $30,000.00 is a drop in the bucket, and is also wondering if the college looking to streamline its administrative processes is a 10+1 issue. What we know is that this invitation to participate was forwarded to faculty, It did not stay in the administrative realm.

6. Zoom comment: we should want assurances on how the data will be handled.
7. A senator requested for us to ask for more information on how this will impact/affect faculty, etc. Slide 19 on LBCCC AI Strategy examples were pointed out. It looks like this company will offer a structure/project management support- identify bottlenecks that AI can help work through, and each college will develop and launch the tool themselves.
8. A senator pointed out that an AI tool can be created without paying someone to do that.
9. A senator agrees that we are asking important questions. Years ago we applied for Achieving the Dream- used in college redesign, and the senator suggested that it is important to ask these important questions in the beginning.
10. Academic Senate President Veronica Lopez stated that she is neither for nor against AI. She is gathering information from Senate so that she can be the voice of the body.
11. A senator asked if we own the tools we create or would we need to subscribe to access those tools.
12. The main question is: What support do faculty need when it comes to AI.
    a. Honesty and transparency: This is not an AI world in the same way it is not an illegal drugs world. A senator does not think students are going to thrive in an AI world.
    b. Another senator doesn't think we should try to be on the cutting edge. Companies' motives are profit. Our motives are education. The senator doesn't think AI will ever figure out how to make life better for human beings. The senator is skeptical that AI will ever be better at figuring out what is good for humans than humans themselves since "AI is artificial intelligence, not artificial wisdom." Do we really want to pay a bunch of money for buggy software? We should not pay money for software that is still being developed. AI is just software and it needs to be proven as a tool before use.
    c. A senator has concerns about being overly reliant on ed tech and thinks we need to focus on human resources instead of technological ones.
    d. A senator is concerned that our administrators want to rely on AI.
    e. A senator pointed out that we could call a person "just a lump of chemicals" just like we can call AI "just software" and pointed out that AI use is included in students' educational programs. Depending on what career path students choose, they might need to learn about this technology and use and apply it appropriately. Another senator did not agree with the "just a lump of chemicals"/"just software" comparison, since the computers that AI runs on are also made out of chemicals

and computers have certain theoretical limitations."

f. A guest pointed out that questions have come up regarding guidelines for college employees using AI to do their jobs. How can employees use AI to do their jobs and what permissions or disclosures are needed? It would be helpful to have disclosure guidelines from the district.
g. From Zoom: We need Guidance in how we are meant to evaluate student use of AI v. Academic Integrity concerns - I know there are honest ways to use AI as a student or in a classroom, but how are we evaluating students while still upholding our academic standards. Right now, most of the feedback I have heard from admin is that we cannot discipline student use of unethical AI use (cheating/plagiarism) without substantive proof, which is impossible currently
h. From Zoom: Does anyone remember Y2K? A lot of $$ was made due to fear...when due diligence could have saved a lot of time and $$. In response, a senator pointed out that a lot of work was put in to prevent problems from happening with Y2K.
i. From Zoom: No matter what it's here, we need to set healthy boundaries for our student and our own professional use.
j. From Zoom: I would be interested in what is the current use of honorlock and other existing tools we have in place at ARC.....and then is their recommended AI language for class syllabi, etc.

14. LRCCD Data ARC Cluster Hiring Pilot 2.0 for Spring 2026
    - LRCCD Data (pages 74-76, from Board of Trustees Retreat)
        i. The following statement in the document was read: "Cluster efforts were revamped at ARC following the results from Spring 2025 with promising results. Demographics of new full-time faculty hires in Spring 2026 at ARC are shown in Table A. New hires from monitored groups are 14 of 28 or 50% of the total hires. Decline to State candidates are 4 new hires (14.2%) and White candidates are 10 new hires (35.7%)."
        ii. President Veronica Lopez asked if there are any questions about this. She invited senators to look at the information and process it. District summary indicated that there seem to be promising results.
    - ARC Office of Research Data
    - Supplemental questions
15. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)
    - Letter of interest
    - Typical Partnership Resource Team (PRT) Process Outline 2026
    - Areas of Focus
        i. President, Past President, Vice President, and Secretary of Academic Senate attended a meeting on Monday, October 5, 2026 to share culture

of communication, processes, purview, etc. (topics in the letter of interest). Information was gathered, and the IEPI team will come back with ideas, tools, additional thoughts in particular areas that we might work on. After the “menu of options” is provided, the college will make a plan and submit the plan to adopt some recommendations and receive grant money to help in the implementation of plans. President Cardoza has indicated that she would like to have a shared plan with Academic Senate based on the IEPI.

ii. A question to senators was: what would we like to improve on in regards to communication?

1. A senator in the chat over Zoom asked who will make the plan and who will approve the plan? The answer was that the IEPI team provides suggestions (operations council, student success council, all major governance groups), and the plan would come from the executive leadership team, and approval would be sought from Academic Senate.

16. Report Back (Feedback from College Areas)
    - Open Issues from any Previous Agenda Item
        i. Resolutions in support of trans students was mentioned before, and it is being noted.
        ii. AB1705 Work Group (? Yes? Workgroup) - prerequisite checker is the top priority, and the group hopes to have something in place by summer 2027 or fall 2027. President Lopez requested updates to continue to be shared with Academic Senate. Another senator indicated that a note to students making it clear that there are prerequisites for courses.
        iii. A senator noted: I had a legislative analyst (lobbyist) come speak to my Persuasion class about political persuasion and this person worked directly on this bill. They said that the bill seems like a good thing, but the fine details are riddled with issues, so it's highly unlikely that many CC's will be able to actually offer 4-year degrees. One of those details is that there is a location aspect of the bill that says something like there can't be a 4-year institution that offers a degree in that field within 100 miles of the community college. If there is, the CC can't offer the same degree. So, for us that basically means we can't offer anything that is not already available at CSUS or UCD.
        iv. A senator read feedback from a member from a member of the math faculty after a discussion in the math department meeting about cluster hiring. Here is the text: “I would like to advocate for continuing the Cluster Hire pilot program and establishing more rigorous methods for assessing its impact. As for my own experience with it so far, I have served on a variety of hiring committees for positions that that recruited primarily from industry rather than academia. The cluster hire questions gave applicants a significant opportunity to detail experiences that were very relevant to the position but probably would not have come out in so much detail during the interview process. It was also pretty clear who was addressing the questions from lived experience compared to the ones who were just responding from a more intellectual perspective that had

not been fully lived. I think this gave the committees I was on important information that informed our interview pool in very positive ways. So, I think these questions can be very helpful in at least some disciplines."

17. Report Out (Information from District Meetings and Other Areas)
    - Other District Meetings
        i. Deputy Chancellor Meeting -
            1. Senate Presidents expressed interest to meet to discuss HR issues
            2. NAGPRA Policies, General Counsel Review
                a. What was shared is the apology language to the tribes will likely be changed to a separate statement. Apology language to the faculty will likely be removed.
                b. We are hoping this will come back to DAS and to local Academic Senates.
                c. There is a lot of disappointment in this development because of the time and effort that was put into this work already.
                d. If there are substantive changes, and it is not returned to the Senate for approval, VP Daniel Slutsky plans to bring forward a resolution against the NAGPRA and Human Remains policy.
            3. Updates on where we are in the process as this moves to the Board
        ii. IT Technology & Communication & Governance
            1. Example: Adobe Licenses
            2. Example: Microsoft A1 Licensing Impact
        iii. Prison Reentry Education Program recommendations from the DAS PREP Sub committee reports
        iv. DAS - LRCCD Regulation 7252, Regulatory update on Academic Renewal to align with Title 5 changes Draft R-7252 and CCCCO Title 5 Guidance Memo
        v. DAS Resolution in Support of Teleconferencing Capabilities for the LRCCD District Academic Senate
            1. Updates will be provided when available.
        vi. District Ed Tech report
18. Items from College Areas for Academic Senate Consideration
    - Motion to close the meeting, and second.

Meeting adjourned 4:51pm

Upcoming Meetings and Events

- Board of Trustees Meeting, Oct. 14th, 3-5 pm, Sacramento City College
- District Academic Senate Meeting, Oct. 20th, 3-5 pm, District Office Conference Room

- ARC Academic Senate Meeting, Oct 22nd, 2:30 -5:30 pm, ARC Student Center Board Room

ARC Academic Senate Sign-In Sheet & Roll Call **09-24-2026**	Role	Voting as Alternate for (name of senator)	In-Person	Remote	Absent	UDAC Vote
Veronica Lopez	President		✅			
Daniel Slutsky	Vice President		✅			yes
Mieke San Julian	Secretary		✅			yes
Alisa Shubb	Past President		✅			yes
Adrianne Avila	FT	X	✅			yes
Ally Joye	FT	X	✅			yes
Amy Gaudard	FT	X	✅			abstain
Andrew Boyd	Alt FT					

Ben French	FT	X			✅	
Caitlin Zumalt	PT	X	✅			yes
Cesar Reyes (parental leave Fall)	FT	X				
Cheryl Tsushima	Alt PT					
Chris Moore	PT	X	✅			yes
Christian Speck	PT	X		✅		yes
Connie Ayala	FT	X			✅	
David Bell	Alt PT					
David McCusker	FT	X	✅			yes
David Munoz	FT	X	✅			yes
Diane Lui	PT	X		✅		yes
Eric Black	FT	X			✅	
Erik Haarala	Alt FT					
Gaby Meindl	PT	X	✅			abstain
ARC Academic Senate Sign-In Sheet & Roll Call **09-24-2026**	Role	Alternate for (name of senator)	In-Person	Remote	Absent	UDAC Vote
Heidi Bennett	FT	X			✅	
Jacqueline Yago	FT	X	✅			yes
Janay Lovering	FT	X			✅	
Jason Keith	FT	X	✅			yes
Jennifer Scalzi	FT	X	✅			yes
Justus Carlisle	PT	X	✅			abstain
Kevin Van Den Bogert	FT	X			✅	
Kim Herrell	Alt FT					
Kris Fertel	FT	X	✅			yes
Lana Anishchenko	Alt FT					
(Leroy) Adam Austin	FT	X	✅			yes

Lisa Delgado	FT	X			✅	
Marianne Harris	Alt FT					
Michael Angelone	FT	X			✅	
Michael Crowder	FT	X	✅			yes
Michael Nakada	Alt FT	X	✅			yes
Michael Sweet	FT	X	✅			yes
Mihaela Badea-Mic	Alt PT					
Mikhail Drobot	FT	X		✅		yes
Nicole Mann	FT	X	✅			yes
Paul Knox	Alt PT					
Pat Wood	FT	X			✅	
Rachael Simon	FT	X	✅			abstain
Raquel Tejomaya	PT	X	✅			yes
Ray Simmons	Alt FT					
ARC Academic Senate Sign-In Sheet & Roll Call **09-24-2026**	Role	Alternate for (name of senator)	In-Person	Remote	Absent	UDAC Vote
Seth Clark	FT	X			✅	
Shannon Pries	Alt FT	Voting for Michael Angelone				yes
Steve Thompson	FT	X	✅			yes
Susan Chou	FT	X	✅			abstain
Susan Ramones	Alt FT					
Tak Auyeung	FT	X	✅			yes
Tim Finnecy	FT	X	✅			abstain
Vivian Orcasitas Dillon	FT	X			✅	
Ray Simmons	Alt	Voting for Vivian Dillon		✅		yes
Araceli Badilla	Alt	Voting for Cesar Reyes, on behalf of Marianne Harris				yes