



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 6, 2019

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Senate Chambers  
Bertolini 4638

ZOOM LOCATION: Petaluma Campus  
Call 609

ZOOM ID: 981 881 211

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/981881211>

### PRESENT:

J. Arild, L. Aspinall, P. Bell, J. Carlin-Goldberg, A. Donegan, T. Ehret, S. Fichera, B. Flyswithhawks, M. Hughes Markovics, A. Insull, J. Kosten, S. Martin, L. Nahas, G. Navarro, C. Norton, M. Ohkubo, S. Rosen (Petaluma Campus), L. Sparks, M. Starkey (Petaluma Campus), K. Swinstrom, E. Thompson, J. Thompson, N. Wheeler, S. Whyllly

### ABSENT:

N. Persons, A. Spall, A. Thomas

### GUESTS:

S. Conrad, D. Webb, G. Tilles, J. Saldaña Talley, F. Chong, K. Frindell Teuscher

### CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:16 p.m. by President E. Thompson.

### OPEN FORUM:

1. **T. Ehret** expressed her concern regarding the trend toward online instruction and the digitalization of education, and the growing number of students dealing with online addictions. She encouraged the college to increase the awareness and support for this type of addiction as it emphasizes online education.

### MINUTES:

January 16, 2019

J. Thompson and T. Ehret suggested several grammatical corrections to the minutes. J. Thompson requested that Board be added in front of attendance policy under discussion item 2, Syllabus Policy, 3.9.1P. L. Aspinall clarified that she did not volunteer for the faculty handbook subcommittee.

J. Carlin-Goldberg made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

### ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None

### REPORTS:

1. **President's Report** – E. Thompson sent out the full president's report prior to the meeting.
  - **Academic Senate Elections** are coming up. Half of the senators and the president-elect will be elected this cycle. An additional senator, who is not running, is needed for the elections committee. S. Martin volunteered.
  - **Statewide Senate**
    - **Area B Meeting** – Conan McKay, the elected Area B representative, abruptly stepped down and Mayra Cruz of DeAnza College was appointed to replace him. The Area B meeting will be held on the Friday of spring break at Monterey Peninsula College. Area B represents the

greater Bay Area and the Area B meeting is used to discuss issues and resolutions that the area wants to bring to plenary. Breakfast and lunch are provided, and anyone is welcome to attend. J. Carlin-Goldberg volunteered to attend.

- **Plenary** will be held April 11-13 at the Westin San Francisco Airport. E. Thompson, P. Bell, J. Kosten, and J. Thompson are confirmed to attend.
- **The Faculty Leadership Council (FLC)**, consisting of faculty leaders from the Academic Senate, All Faculty Association (AFA), and the Department Chairs Council (DCC), met on Monday with Board President Burns and discussed mutual interests and shared values, and expressed the desire to share faculty concerns with the board. E. Thompson noted his appreciation for B. Flyswithawks and her courage to bring forward issues and confront people with the truth. He found the meeting to be valuable and is optimistic about the faculty-board relationship going forward.
- **Guided Pathways (GP)** – The GP Steering Committee recently learned that the Chancellor's Office (CO) has hired EdInsights, a research company based at Sacramento State University, to do a study evaluating the CO's implementation of GP in the state. SRJC has been selected as one of 12 colleges to participate in this study. The steering committee met with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and a member of the EdInsights team and decided by consensus, with mixed feelings, to participate in the study on the condition that they extend the visit to late April. The steering committee made it very clear that SRJC has an ambivalent relationship with GP and that we may or may not decide to continue with it. E. Thompson encouraged senators to attend the GP meeting this Friday from 8:00-11:00.

**ACTION:**

None

**CONSENT:**

None

**DISCUSSION:**

1. **Assignments and Methods of Evaluation in the Course Outline of Record (COR)** – Guests S. Conrad, G. Tilles, and D. Webb were asked to provide context and explain how the Assignments and Methods of Evaluation section of the COR works. Many faculty experience frustration with this section rejecting the numbers they enter. G. Tilles noted that he inherited the coding and the algorithm from the old system, and that he is not sure exactly how the section works or if it is based on any specific state or local requirements. It was noted that the left side has to equal less than 100 and the right side has to equal more than 100 and that the limits are there so that you cannot create something that is not possible.

Potential uses for the section voiced by senators included: used by departments to ensure that students are evaluated in a manner that prepares them to progress to the next class; used by new faculty; used by students to determine if a class will be a good fit.

Suggestions and concerns voiced by the senate included: removing the section if it is not required; allowing the department or discipline to decide; lack of consensus on the meaning of the categories; and conducting further research to determine what is required.

This topic will be brought back for further discussion.

2. **Bylaws Subcommittee** – The Bylaws Subcommittee presented two proposals for the composition of the executive committee. Option one allows for any member of the electorate, including adjuncts, to run for any position on the executive committee, and option two allows only tenured faculty to run for president or vice president. Both options include a supplemental executive committee member position to ensure that both full-time and adjuncts are represented on the

executive committee.

Concerns and suggestions voiced by the senate included: the potential for option two to remove the right of an adjunct to serve as vice president which is currently allowed; the responsibility to faculty members should drive the decision; breaking down the options further and voting on whether the president should be tenured, whether the vice president should be tenured, and whether there should be a separate adjunct position on the executive committee; keeping in mind that the decision to change the constitution is ultimately up to the constituency to approve; hearing from other institutions who have had adjunct academic senate presidents; it is unlikely that an unprepared adjunct would run and even less likely that they would win; concerns related to compensation; and the structural and systemic protections linked to tenure.

This issue will be brought back for further discussion. Senators were encouraged to get feedback from their constituents and to email the subcommittee with any questions or concerns.

- 3. Aligning Goals with the Vision for Success** – The state is requiring colleges to set institutional goals that align with the Vision for Success. E. Thompson encouraged the senators to share ideas on how to meet the goals we set and what some of the inherent problems of setting such goals might be. It was noted that these goals are separate from the Strategic Plan. Vice President of Academic Affairs J. Saldaña-Talley noted that this is a difficult situation but she believes we can set the goals while continuing to advocate and encouraged faculty to attend the board listening session in early March to express their concerns. President Chong noted that while many of the goals are aspirational he believes we should set our goals based on the needs of our unique student population.

Suggestions and concerns voiced by the senate included: clearly defining what is required by law and the consequences of non-participation; issues with the implementation process that excluded shared governance, was coercive, and did not take into account the best interests of students; the potential for auto-awarding to be detrimental to students; the lack of capacity at the UCs and CSUs if goal two is met; the goals are not realistic or practical; the potential for there to be equity gaps that cannot be remedied; having a contingency plan in place to deal with the impact to students if we decide to opt out; and advising the board to be minimally compliant with the goals we do not agree with.

This topic will be brought back for further discussion.

**INFORMATION:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.