



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: April 19, 2019

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: Santa Rosa Campus
Bertolini 4638

ZOOM ID: 981 881 211

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

PRESENT:

P. Bell, J. Carlin-Goldberg, A. Donegan, T. Ehret, B. Flyswithhawks, J. Kosten, S. Martin, L. Nahas, M. Ohkubo, A. Spall, L. Sparks, K. Swinstrom, A. Thomas, E. Thompson, J. Thompson, N. Wheeler, S. Whyllly

ABSENT:

L. Aspinall, J. Arild, S. Fichera, M. Hughes Markovics, A. Insull, G. Navarro, C. Norton, N. Persons, S. Rosen, M. Starkey

GUESTS:

A. Forrester, J. Stover, P. Usina

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 10:13 a.m. by President E. Thompson.

OPEN FORUM:

1. **B. Flyswithhawks** expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to discuss the items on the agenda and for the documents sent out by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the departments to help guide the conversation. She noted that this is an opportunity to move forward, to set the foundation for the next 100 years, and to stop giving lip service to diversity and to give the opportunity for all people to serve in leadership roles. She encouraged the Senators to keep in mind that they represent their areas and their constituents, not just their own thinking.
2. **J. Stover** is a member of the Guided Pathways (GP) workgroup who recently attended the Sacramento GP workshop and he noted two takeaways that he hopes the Senate will consider while making decisions regarding GP. The first takeaway is the importance of collaboration. He believes it is of crucial importance for faculty and classified staff to work together in partnership supported by administration with input from students in order to improve the overall experience of students and not just the classroom experience. He suggested that we find a way to extend release time to classified and that the Senate select one goal or project for faculty, one for classified, and one for administration. The second takeaway is that we should no longer be questioning if but how. He noted that SRJC's inquiry work was referenced and presented as a model for other schools at the workshop and that GP is only one of many challenges the institution is facing. He believes the questions we should be asking are how do we customize GP efforts for ongoing success; how do we maximize our talents, skills, and history; and how do we successfully navigate the many challenges we face.
3. **E. Thompson** presented a short summary of parliamentary practices that he drafted to make explicit some of the rules of conversation. He noted that this is not a duplication of the bylaws and that there are two sources governing the Senate's parliamentary procedure, the Brown Act, which is law; and Robert's Rules of Order, which is optional. The full document will be posted to the Senate website.

DISCUSSION:

1. Guided Pathways and the Scale of Adoption Form

- **Guided Pathways:** Vice President A. Donegan framed the conversation. Two hours were set

aside for this topic. The first hour was set up as a robust, free for all conversation focusing on the big picture, do we want to go forward with GP, as well as the small picture, looking at the recommendations produced by the GP Workgroup, discussing how the workgroup will be structured next year, and their direction and charge going forward. The second hour was set up to focus on completing the Scale of Adoption Form. It was noted that we have not been getting consistent information from the Chancellor's Office (CO) regarding GP and that is unlikely to change. The reality is we have about \$250,000 of GP funds left over from this year and will be getting another \$600,000 or \$700,000, the oversight of which falls under the purview of the Senate, that can be used to pay faculty experts to research, design, develop, and implement some of the recommendations.

Concerns voiced by the Senate included: GP and similar categorical funding being used as a way to promote certain agenda items that are concocted externally from the college or the system as a whole, that restrains our budget, and has to be used for specific items and often has strings attached; the primary difficulty driving the gaps in equity is due to the fact that our faculty, the central body that is delivering education and serving student's needs, are overworked and exhausted; recognizing that the amount of work will not change regardless of whether the work is done within the existing structure or a new structure; initiatives being used as an effort to disrupt and undermine our institution, and cause chaos and a sense of urgency driven by external forces, which causes us to think poorly and make quick decisions and does not produce the promised results; the potential for the CO to withhold funding; the trend toward corporatization and producing workers instead of thinkers; and the known inaccuracies of the data produced by the CO.

Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: using the funding to repair and work within the existing shared governance system instead of creating a new group; implementing the tri-chair model and recognizing that some area experts may be classified or administrators; clarifying the roles and purview of the various constituent groups; discussing our driving values and what we hope to achieve and using that to determine our decisions; having clearly defined job descriptions and transparent vetting procedures that include the use of a rubric system; communicating with and involving the people responsible for implementation to avoid issues; including demands to the state to provide us with the kinds of consistency and support that we need to carry out the work; focusing on the things we know are going to work, like expanding the Peer Assisted Learning Specialist (PALS) program; using the EdInsights interviews as an opportunity to express our concerns; only using CO data when required for reporting, using our own data when making decisions, and pointing out any discrepancies to the CO; and taking our concerns about the undermining of our values as educators and citizens forward in a more formal way.

E. Thompson noted that the Board is drafting a letter protesting the methods of the CO.

- **Scale of Adoption Form** – It was noted that there would be no consequences to selecting “not occurring” on most lines.

Suggested proposals for further consideration: expanding the PALS and Student Ambassador Programs, website redesign, program mapping, First Year Experience (FYE), expanding onboarding, Summer Bridge, expanding identity and interest based learning communities, scheduling coordination, and reevaluating the academic calendar.

Concerns voiced by the Senate included: the difficulty posed to collaboration between students and faculty due to the students having Gmail accounts and faculty having Outlook accounts; the lack of IT participation in GP meetings; the potential increased workload to chairs if all of the suggested proposals are implemented at once; and classes for fall have already been assigned but the MOU has not been negotiated yet.

Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: using “not occurring” to signify our lack of endorsement; noting on the form that some things are not systematic because they are not appropriate to all disciplines; report as little as possible so as not to tie our hands; using GP funds to adjust or redirect things that already exist, like the website redesign; including counselors to advise in the redesign of programs; more participation of discipline faculty in advising students; be as general as possible and if we are going to be precise limit it to things like PALS that everyone can benefit from; making sure equitable compensation is available to faculty who are doing GP work; not committing financially to anything long-term; leveraging the re-organization to incorporate the proposed changes; giving chairs the ability to appoint faculty members to positions to cover some of the workload; emphasizing on the form what we do not approve of and why to prevent the CO from using our responses as confirmation of their goals; identifying proposals that already have funding from another source; balancing coordination and oversight with transparency and the democratic process; and making sure that programs are implemented across all sites.

E. Thompson noted that there is not time for the Senate to vote on the final version of the form before it is submitted. B. Flyswithhawks requested that the final version still be brought to the next Senate meeting.

- 2. Bylaws and Constitutional Changes** – the intention of this discussion is to have an idea of what to bring to the larger Senate as the proposal to present to the electorate regarding who is eligible for the Executive Committee. The options include one, open the presidency to adjuncts; and two, have an adjunct seat on the Executive Committee.

Concerns voiced by the Senate included: the potential for terms like proposal, recommendation, and option to affect the way people vote; presenting multiple options could result in no option getting 2/3s of the vote; the lack of Senators present at this retreat to participate in the conversation; the ongoing concern with the differences between adjunct and full-time faculty and the appearance of corruption or conflict of interest; balancing the responsibility of the representative with the responsibility of the voter; and whether institutional change should come from within the institution or outside.

Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: exploring the option of ranked voting; giving the electorate the options with explanations or pros and cons, like a voter guide; bringing the Executive Committee changes to the electorate separate from the noncontroversial mechanical changes; including the option to vote for no change; combining the mechanical changes with the area changes; and presenting the options, with explanations, one at a time, unless the first option balloted receives 2/3s of the vote.

It was generally agreed that two options would be presented at the next Senate meeting, option a, to send options one and two to the electorate sequentially if the first option to be balloted does not receive 2/3s of the vote; and option b, to send options one and two to the electorate together.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.