



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: May 2, 2018

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Senate Chambers
Bertolini 4638

ZOOM ID: 168 274 458

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/168274458>

PRESENT:

L. Aspinall, S. Avasthi, P. Bell, J. Carlin-Goldberg, T. Ehret, R. Fautley, S. Fichera, A. Graziani, M. Ichikawa, A. Insull, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, D. King, D. Kirklin, J. Kosten, C. McClure, N. Mulkovich, L. Nahas (via Zoom), G. Navarro, C. Norton, N. Persons, F. Pugh, S. Rosen, M. Starkey, E. Thompson, K. Walker, S. Whyly

ABSENT:

None

GUESTS:

D. Gooch, J. Miller, R. Gattinella, C. Williams, R. Eyler, J. Lau

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President E. Thompson.

OPEN FORUM:

D. Gooch, Mathematics faculty, requested that something be done about Barracuda, the current email security program. He has missed several time sensitive emails from students and has even had difficulty receiving email from people that he has "whitelisted" using the program.

MINUTES:

April 18, 2018.

Motion: J. Carlin-Goldberg made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None

REPORTS:

1. President's Report – E. Thompson

- **Brown Act Workshop** – E. Thompson attended the workshop with the Academic Senate Administrative Assistant, J. Melvin. R. Ethington, Trustee Burns, Z. Miranda, J. Pinaula, and M. Sandberg, also attended from SRJC. As a result of the workshop the following changes have been made to the normal Academic Senate procedures: all locations where senators are participating via videoconference must be ADA accessible and have a hard copy of the agenda posted 72-hours in advance of the meeting in a location that is accessible to the public 24-hours a day; a roll-call vote must be taken for every vote whenever a senator is voting via videoconference; brief explanations have been added to agenda items; and the "Discussion" header of the agenda has been changed to "For Discussion and Possible Action." It was noted that the last two items are not requirements but recommendations of the Brown Act, and that it is not a Brown Act violation to vote on an agenda item that is listed as a discussion item.
- **Shared Governance** is being discussed in multiple meetings across the district as a result of the, now rescinded, unilateral decision to cancel summer classes. Those involved in the conversation are in the process of rethinking shared governance and refashioning it so that it is more

transparent, authentic, and effective. There will be more specifics as the conversation progresses.

- **Appreciative Inquiry Workshop** – E. Thompson spoke at the event and would like to promote the practice of having presentation materials sent in advance so that more time can be spent in discussion and debate.
- **Communication and Collaboration** – In an attempt to improve communication and collaboration across the district the Academic Senate Executive Committee is working on establishing liaison positions to the Classified Senate and the Student Government Assembly, and will be giving a presentation to the management team regarding the 10 + 1, faculty purview, and the meaning of shared governance.
- **Executive Committee Elections** – Both the Vice President and Secretary are stepping down from the Executive Committee. Elections will be held at the next meeting. All senators are encouraged to consider running.

2. The New Summit Institute – J. Miller. The New Summit Institute came about as a response to the Chancellor's Office's attempt to rebrand and market Career Education (CE) programs. The 28 Bay Area colleges were not in agreement with what the Chancellor's Office proposed and decided to come up with their own marketing and promotional materials. The target audience is 19-30 year olds and the goals of the marketing program include: highlighting CE as another choice rather than comparing it to 4-year institutions; and eliminating the negative connotations often associated with CE programs. Concerns and suggestions voiced by the Senate included: lack of inclusion of the Business Department in the process; coordinating with programs that may need more time to grow before being considered for cuts; and changing the name. It was noted that this is a work in progress and that feedback is welcome. There will be a PDA presentation on this topic.

3. Plenary Reports

- N. Persons provided her full report to the Senators ahead of the meeting.
 - Guided Pathways – Many colleges were ambivalent about Guided Pathways despite having signed on. Colleges are taking different approaches to Guided Pathways, including meta-majors, and many have found the process valuable even if they are not fully in agreement.
 - AB 705 – Much of what was discussed during this session was ESL students and how they will navigate the system.
 - Performance-Based Funding – The biggest takeaway from this session was that we need to talk to our legislators. Many people are concerned that performance-based funding will exacerbate social equity and justice issues.
- M. Starkey attended plenary for the first time. His main takeaway is the need for administration, faculty, and students to communicate, work together, and compromise. He felt that much of what the Chancellor is doing is disrespectful to faculty and unnecessarily divisive when they should be working as a team with faculty to provide the best education for students.

CONSENT:

1. 4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring – R. Faulty

Motion: T. Johnson made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded and the consent agenda was approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

ACTION:

1. 4.3.2b/P, Equivalency – R. Faulty noted that non-substantive, grammatical changes can be made after the policy and procedure are approved.

Motion: N. Persons made a motion to approve 4.3.2b/P. The motion was seconded and 4.3.2b/P was approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

2. 8.1.1/P, Accommodation – T. Johnson

Motion: L. Aspinall made a motion to approve 8.1.1/P. The motion was seconded and 8.1.1/P was approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

1. 3.15/P, Final Examinations – R. Fautley is proposing a change that would make it permissible for 5-unit lab classes to have a second final during finals week.

Motion: T. Jacobson made a motion to move this to an action item. The motion was seconded and was passed by roll-call vote unanimously.

Motion: J. Carlin-Goldberg made a motion to suspend the rules to vote on this action item today. The motion was seconded and approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

Motion: J. Carlin-Goldberg made a motion to approve 3.15/P. The motion was seconded and 3.15/P was approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

2. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sonoma State University (SSU) – C. Williams, R. Eyer, and J. Lau brought this back to the Senate for further discussion. The goal of the program is to allow SRJC students, who have completed their pre-transfer courses, to transfer to the SSU Extended Education Program but to take their SSU classes on the SRJC campus. The classes would potentially be taught by SRJC faculty who would work as adjuncts for SSU, and would give SRJC faculty a chance to teach upper-division classes if they so choose. The program is set up as a cohort model with prescriptive course requirements, to ensure course availability, but with the ability to modify if necessary. Cost recovery will be provided for services like facilities, utilities, DRD and the Library. A big incentive of the program for students with guaranteed CSU admission is that they would be able to stay closer to home rather than being put in the campus selection lottery. Concerns and suggestions voiced by the Senate included: contacting the All Faculty Association (AFA) to determine if there are any faculty workload issues that should be considered; making sure that there are no licensing issues for the library; calling it 2-year transfer, instead of just transfer, sets an unrealistic expectation for most students; concerns that many students who would be attracted to this type of program would have difficulty taking a full-load of classes; concerns about workload for impacted departments, like DRD, if the program were to grow; concerns that SRJC students would be competing with students from other schools; concerns with scheduling during peak times; and concerns with logistics and parking. This topic will be brought back in the fall for further discussion and potential endorsement.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.