



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: April 17, 2019

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Santa Rosa Campus  
Bertolini 4638

ZOOM LOCATION: Petaluma Campus  
Call 609

ZOOM ID: 981 881 211

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

### PRESENT:

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

### ABSENT:

L. Aspinall, N. Persons, S. Rosen

### GUESTS:

L. Collier, C. Valencia, K. Jamshidi, T. Johnson

### CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:19 p.m. by President E. Thompson.

### OPEN FORUM:

None

### MINUTES:

April 3, 2019 – J. Thompson and S. Martin requested amendments to the minutes. The minutes were approved as amended without objection.

### ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None

### REPORTS:

- 1. President's Report** – E. Thompson sent out the full president's report prior to the meeting. He noted that J. Thompson is now the President-Elect and that the new senators will be announced at the last Academic Senate meeting of the year. He encouraged everyone to attend the Faculty Recognition Ceremony on May 2, which is sponsored by the Academic Senate. J. Carlin-Goldberg and A. Forrester were selected to receive the Academic Senate President's award; the other awardees will be announced soon.
- 2. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Spring Plenary Reports**
  - **E. Thompson** met with academic senate presidents and faculty from other colleges who have passed resolutions of no confidence in Chancellor Oakley. The ASCCC President, John Stankas, indicated that the Chancellor's Office has improved from utterly unacceptable to barely functional. The group decided that they needed to acknowledge, affirm, and encourage the improvement, but to continue to actively express their views and criticism regarding continuing problems.
  - **P. Bell** attended the following sessions: In Sync with Title 5 and AB 705, which discussed how AB 705 was legislated and its implications; Prison Education, which discussed how education is

transforming students and dramatically changing prison dynamics; Budgeting, which discussed the 50% law, the FON, and the 75/25 goal and how they relate to hiring; and Adopting OEI Course Rubric for Local Use, which discussed how the rubric would be used and if it would be required. She noted that there was significant discussion and concern expressed throughout the plenary about the statistics produced by the Chancellor's Office and how they are used and interpreted.

- **J. Thompson** noted the collegiality and the investment in local senates of the plenary attendees. She attended a session moderated by former executive director of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), Jonathan Lightman, which featured a panel of former ASCCC presidents. The conversation focused on the direction of the system and concerns related to the current top-down model. The panelists expressed their belief that the days of top-down, mandate-driven, reform efforts are not sustainable and encouraged the attendees to be ready to move with innovation locally in the event that the system collapses or is weakened. She also attended the following sessions: a session on coding, which discussed the new, student centered, funding formula and the importance of correctly coding courses to receive the proper funding credit; a session on onboarding, which discussed the first point of contact for a student to getting the student through the door of the classroom, and engaging the "chaos" and diversity of that process instead of forcing linearity; a session on faculty diversification, which included a conversation with Daisy Gonzalez, deputy Chancellor of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO); and a session on credit for prior learning, which discussed the change from credit by exam only to credit for prior learning that includes credit by exam, broadening the category, which would be of particular benefit to veterans.
  - **J. Kosten** attended five sessions that included: Equivalency to Associates Degree, which discussed how to increase the pool of qualified Career Education (CE) instructors by addressing faculty recruitment and hiring practices, clarifying legislative and regulatory barriers, and standardizing the equivalency process; a session on open education resources (OER), which discussed the burden of high textbook prices and the effect on students, particularly disproportionately impacted student groups, and the initiative to increase OER availability and reduce costs for students; a session on work-based learning, which discussed the approved ASCCC resolution to create a paper that clearly defines and differentiates for CE all the different work experience and apprenticeship categories; a session on credit for prior learning, which talked about guidelines for how prior learning can be properly translated to college courses; and a session on the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), which discussed a framework for course identification and model coursework.
- 3. Legislative Liaison Report** – P. Bell included in the report the legislative bill cycle. The ASCCC is currently watching the following bills: AB 2, College Promise, re-writing the language to exclude students who already have a degree or certificate from the two-year fee waiver; AB 30, Dual Enrollment, regarding the pathway from high school to college; AB 130 and SB 3, CPEC Reboot, which is a returning bill that would set up an Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability, it was noted that the ASCCC is currently opposed to this bill; AB 302, Homeless Student Parking, which would allow students to spend the night in California Community College (CCC) parking lots, concerns include liability and unintended consequences; SB 291, Financial Aid, which would establish a CCC Student Financial Aid Program administered by the Board of Governors (BOG); and SB 462, Forestland Restoration Program, concerns include the numerous restoration programs already in existence and the overreach of the legislature into curriculum. Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) is currently watching the following bills: AB 897, which would raise the 67% ceiling on adjuncts to 80-85%, concerns include the potential to curtail full-time hiring and negatively disrupt local bargaining unit contracts; AB 463, loan forgiveness for CCC faculty; AB 706, carryover of reassignment rights; AB 1689, College Mental Health Services Program, which would increase funding for mental health services on

campuses; and SJR 3, Social Security Status, which aims to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset.

**CONSENT:**

None

**ACTION:**

None

**DISCUSSION:**

- 1. Equity Plan** – L. Collier and C. Valencia, co-chairs of the Integrated Student Success Committee (ISSC), brought the draft of the Student Equity and Achievement 2019-22 Planning and Equity Goals for Senate feedback and approval. The ISSC is the consolidation of the Student Success & Support Program (SSSP), Student Equity, and the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI). The structure of the ISSC is based on three key pillars, Invited and Welcomed, Guided and Supported, and Engaged and Welcomed. It was noted that the Guided Pathways Workgroup has also adopted this framework. In addition to the metrics required by the Chancellor's Office (CO), ISSC has worked with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to determine the best local metrics to use to evaluate and assess the impact of their work on our students. The student equity populations identified by the CO include: current or former foster youth; students with disabilities; low-income students; veterans; students in the following ethnic and racial categories, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, some other race, more than one race; homeless students; lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender students; and additional categories of students determined by the governing board of the community college district. The CO requires that the plan include goals for reducing equity gaps in the following metrics: Access, among all applicants in the previous or selected year, the proportion who enrolled in a community college in the selected year; Math and English, among all students, the proportion who completed transfer-level math and English in their first academic year of credit enrollment within the district; Retention, among all students, the proportion retained from fall to spring at a college in the selected year, excluding students who completed an award or transferred to a postsecondary institution; Transfer, among all students, the number of students who transferred to various types of postsecondary institutions; and Vision Goal, among all students, the unduplicated count of students who earned one or more of the following: CO approved certificate, associate degree, and/or CCC baccalaureate degree, and had an enrollment in the selected or previous year. OIR extracted data to identify which groups at SRJC are disproportionately impacted to determine who we need to set goals for and how many students it would take per metric and group to meet ISSC's recommended goal of a 50% equity gap reduction in three years. The Institutional Planning Council (IPC) is responsible for determining the final goals for the overall student population. It was noted that this plan is due to the CO in June, and needs to go to the Board for approval in May. The signatories include the President, the Chief Business Officer, the Chief Instructional Officer, the Chief Student Services Officer, and the President of the Academic Senate.

Concerns and suggestions voiced by the Senate included: the reasonableness of aligning and incorporating so many goals and so much information and making it ours in such a short timeline; where is the data coming from; the general amount of reform rolling out over the last decade and the overstepping onto faculty purview and the academic program; and the statistical significance of the sample sizes of some of the smaller disproportionately impacted groups.

This topic will be brought back for further discussion.

- 2. Class Size/Waitlist Task Force** – A. Donegan and K. Jamshidi presented on behalf of L. Aspinall. The Class Size/Waitlist Task Force is a subgroup of the Academic Senate that has been tasked with discussing class size and waitlist.

Regarding class size, the task force has agreed to the following guiding principles: class maximums are determined by discipline based on pedagogy; disciplines must determine a base class size for each course; and there are factors that may increase or decrease a base class size on the section level, but do not drive the determination of a base class size. They have created a rubric to share with disciplines as an optional tool to assist them in their determination of class size. Once the disciplines determine pedagogically appropriate class sizes, the numbers will be sent to the All Faculty Association (AFA) to negotiate. It was noted that the District will be moving from a focus on efficiency to productivity, and that will need to be considered. The task force is working from the assumption that productivity determines minimum class sizes while the task force's work is focused on determining class maximums.

Regarding the wait list policy, they have shared a working draft of a Waitlist FAQ with the Senate for feedback and have met with the Vice President of Student Services (VPSS) and the Dean of Admissions and Enrollment to determine what is possible to implement with our current Student Information System (SIS). The next step will be to revise the current Waitlist Policy and Procedure. The task force's proposed changes include: no longer charging students registration fees to be on a waitlist; allowing students to be on conflicting waitlists; students will no longer automatically roll from the waitlist, they will need to decide if they want to register for the class; waitlists will become inactive at the start of the class, and instructors that want to add additional students from the waitlist can use add codes. They are asking for feedback on the following: if waitlists truly function as waitlists, should all sections have to have them; should there be a standard minimum; and is it okay for students to stay on waitlists for different sections of the same course.

Concerns and suggestions voiced by the Senate included: students would want to know that there is some realistic chance to get into the class; working with Distance Education to ensure that students who cannot fit in the classroom do not get automatically rolled into the Canvas section; alerting students via text versus email; having unduplicated lists of waitlisted students for use by chairs; issues with the confidentiality of negotiations and the potential to pit faculty against AFA; how can students on multiple waitlists attend the first day of all of the classes; keeping the waitlist visible after the start of the class, but freezing it so no more students can be added; excluding the consideration of productivity from the conversation and focusing on pedagogy; limiting the number of waitlists a student can be on; the potential for students to use the waitlist to shop around for specific instructors; working out how to understand the negotiation process better and AFA's role; using hits after close instead of a never-ending waitlist; advocating for something less complicated that still satisfies the needs being addressed; disciplines need to be able to do what is best for their students; and will the waitlist function properly for extended and large lecture classes.

E. Thompson noted that a productivity group has been formed that includes the presidents of the Academic Senate and AFA and department chairs, and is a separate operation with the potential to be in tension with the recommendations of the task force.

#### **INFORMATION:**

- 1. Testing and Associated Support Services (TASS) Update** – T. Johnson presented the TASS update. The task force was formed due to the long-standing District need for proctoring centers and the Academic Senate resolution approved by the Board in March 2018. The implementation of AB 705 created a potential facilities opportunity. The group consists of faculty, classified, students, and administrators, and is chaired by P. Avila, Vice President of Student Services, T. Johnson, Disability Resources faculty, and C. Quiroz, from the Assessment Office. They interviewed other, like-sized colleges to determine best practices and are continuing to get more information on specifics. The task force's current recommendation is that "Proctoring and Support Services Centers" be implemented with Plover Hall as the recommended location for the Santa Rosa Campus and the recommendation pending for the location of the Petaluma Campus. The task force will continue to discuss space planning and staffing needs. The initial implementation will focus on the processes for

assessment and accommodated testing with the plan to expand to online and make-up exam proctoring. The timeline for the Santa Rosa Campus is to have the center in place by fall, with the timeline for the Petaluma Campus dependent upon how we move forward with Measure H and other major facilities changes.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

E. Thompson announced that the Academic Senate Retreat will take place Friday, April 19 and will focus on two topics. Food will be provided.

B. Flyswithhawks read a statement on behalf of M. Nazif requesting that the implementation of an honors program be considered in the Guided Pathways discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.