



# ACADEMIC SENATE

The primary voice of the faculty in academic and professional matters at Santa Rosa Junior College.

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: December 20, 2017

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Senate Chambers  
Bertolini 4638

VIDEO CONF: Petaluma Campus  
Mahoney 726

### PRESENT:

S. Avasthi, P. Bell, J. Carlin-Goldberg, R. Fautley, A. Graziani, A. Insull, T. Jacobson, D. King, D. Kirklin, J. Kosten, L. Nahas, G. Navarro, C. Norton, N. Persons, F. Pugh, M. Starkey, K. Walker, N. Wheeler, S. Whyly

### ABSENT:

J. Arild, T. Ehret, S. Fichera, T. Johnson, C. McClure, N. Nasseem, S. Rosen, N. Slovak, E. Thompson

### GUESTS:

M. Rudolph, P. Usina, A. Forrester, S. Martin, J. Thompson, K. Frindell, T. Mulcaire, L. McCauley

### CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Acting President N. Persons.

### DISCUSSION:

The meeting was structured as follows: a discussion allowing Senators to ask clarifying questions regarding Guided Pathways, followed by a plenary style debate where Senators lined up to debate the pros and cons of Guided Pathways, and ending with a debrief.

**Discussion** - The following items were clarified for the Senators: a Guided Pathways budget has been setup under Academic Affairs and will require joint signatures from the Senior VP of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate President with the bulk of the funds likely going to reassign time and professional development but with some funding for Institutional Research and Classified support; the taskforce will be formed by the Academic Senate and will be predominantly made up of faculty with non-faculty available for information purposes only, non-supporters are encouraged to join the taskforce; SRJC will have the opportunity to identify key performance indicators, in addition to those identified by the state, that are meaningful to us; signing off on the first year does not commit us to all five years, in order to get continued funding a yearly report must be submitted; the self-assessment has been completed but has not been signed off by the Academic Senate President, this meeting will be used to help inform that decision; the multi-year plan that is due March 30 has not yet been posted by the state and no work has begun on it, it is assumed that the Academic Senate President would need to sign off on that document as well; while the money cannot be used to hire full-time faculty, it is unclear at this point what expenses will be allowed with the grant funds; the Academic Senate Executive Committee will strive to make the process as transparent as possible; Guided Pathways differentiates between Career Technical Education (CTE) pathways and major exploration for transfer pathways; the idea of these grant funds is that they would be used to create a self-funded program.

### Debate Pros

- Saying no at this point would end the conversation on Guided Pathways, while saying yes would allow the conversation to continue without fully committing.
- Pathways already exist to some degree at SRJC, this funding would facilitate further expansion of those pathways with the possible incorporation of learning communities, on our terms.
- Guided Pathways could facilitate the formation of student and faculty cohorts, which helps to prevent students from falling through the cracks. Taking the funding would allow for the necessary time and support to have a meaningful conversation.

- Opting-in at this point does not prevent us from opting-out at a later date.
- There is not enough information to prove that Guided Pathways was responsible for the cutting of classes and programs at other colleges and not signing could potentially affect AB 19 funding that would benefit middle income students as well as funding that would benefit veterans.
- The money can be used to implement our own vision of Guided Pathways.
- Guided Pathways would be beneficial for first generation students, basic skills students, and non-traditional students who are not looking to explore.
- If we sign on we should be careful to highlight the parts of Guided Pathways that we are in opposition to, like the rubric and use of salary information to advertise to students.
- Accepting the first-year funding would allow for greater faculty input which has been limited due to the lack of funding for release time.

### Debate Cons

- Signing on as early adopters sends the message that we are sanctioning Guided Pathways, it would be better to sign on as pre-adopters in order to have further conversation that includes student voices.
- Guided Pathways implicitly assumes that there is something wrong with the current system and that it is not normal for 18 year old students to not know what they are doing. The term, Guided Pathways, detracts from what it really is, a pipeline or funnel. We could have a conversation about Guided Pathways without taking the funds, which would allow for true freedom of exploration without being tied to state requirements.
- This feels like an encroachment of business into education, as all of the consultants and partners working with the Chancellor's Office are for profit businesses. Without a guarantee of opting out, it also feels like an illusion of inclusion when in fact a decision has already been made.
- The state is putting pressure on colleges to get on board quickly without allowing them to have the robust conversations necessary to make an informed decision and to answer questions like, "Should careers be prioritized?", and "Should non-career related courses and programs be cut?".
- Signing on at this point is a chance to use the funding to press the issue for lower class sizes and increased full-time faculty but choosing to not sign would send a stronger message. If the money could truly be used for whatever we choose then it would not be pre-prescribed.
- It is suspect that AB 19 funding is tied to signing on to Guided Pathways and there is not enough information to prove that Guided Pathways will be successful in raising completion rates and shortening completion times.
- We do not have a clear idea if this is something that students want. They need to be included in the conversation before a decision is made.
- Grant funding has not yielded what was promised and it strengthens administration while weakening faculty.
- The state should be providing on-going funding instead of looking for a "magic pill." Grant funding takes away from funding that could be used to hire full-time faculty.
- Accepting these grant funds has the potential to bring strife between AFA and the Senate and once the funds go away the program becomes the burden of the general fund which puts downward pressure on faculty salaries.
- Rejecting the money would send a powerful message. The reason there has not been enough faculty input is because we do not have enough full-time faculty and this funding will not rectify that.

**Debrief**

Suggestions and concerns voiced by the Senate included: taking the money is more divisive than not taking it; and since the funding will not be available until March we could opt to sign on now and still have the option to take a stand in March when the work plan is due.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.