



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: March 17, 2021

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Zoom only

ZOOM ID: 739 337 730

<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/739337730>

PRESENT

M. Aparicio, L. Aspinall, P. Bell, M. Bojanowski, J. Bush, J. Carlin-Goldberg, C. Crawford, A. Donegan, J. Fassler, B. Flyswithhawks, N. Frantz, C. Hillman, T. Jacobson, J. Kosten, D. Lemmer, S. Martin, L. Nahas, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, R. Romagnoli, G. Sellu, L. Servais, J. Stover, J. Thompson, K. Wegman, S. Whyly, S. Winston

ABSENT

K. Valenzuela (proxy A. Donegan); S. Rosen

GUESTS

D. Mezzera

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President J. Thompson. The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by J. Bush.

OPEN FORUM

1. L. Servais acknowledged that, once again, we are being collectively confronted with acts of violence towards the Asian American and Pacific Islander community across the country; noted that students are looking to faculty for help in understanding how these recent acts are representative of the violence that exists in our country; identified the opportunity for the SRJC college community to do their work; and welcomed the movement into action concerning our values of equity and anti-racism.
2. A. Donegan added, regarding L. Servais's comment, that these recent acts of violence against Asian Americans in America coincide with acts of violence against women internationally; expressed thanks to the Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) for the forthcoming Communities of Practice (CoPs); stated she was "blown away with the level of thought and the breadth of those opportunities for us"; thanked the District for its support and funding of the CoPs; and encouraged the continuing support of CoPs, which enables conversations with fellow academics with expertise that we can "read about, discuss with, and learn from."
3. D. Carmona Benson, SGA Co-President, advocated for the restorative promise of Spring Break; invited everyone, including students, to receive a "true break" over Spring Break; stressed that students need a break and requested senators encourage their constituents to limit assignments over Spring Break; promoted two SGA events, one on April 6 at 5:30 p.m. and another on March 30; encouraged Senators' attendance and noted flyer distribution; highlighted the April 6 conference as a social justice event supporting marginalized students in their discussions on current challenges; highlighted the March 30 panel of local council women and activists; noted the positive changes within the College community and Senate she has observed; and thanked and expressed support for the hard work of the Academic Senate (AS).

4. J. Fassler raised the issue of returning, or not returning, to campus in the fall; recognized there is even more uncertainty now than in previous semesters; asked for patience as this decision is made; asked for time so that the College could make the “right decision” about the timing of returning; sought a way to avoid making a decision we might later regret; noted that vaccinations are proceeding and that students depend “on coming back to college when they’ve lost a job”; expressed care and concern for returning to campus; and advocated for “thoughtful consideration to coming back and what that means.”
5. E. Schmidt expressed agreement with J. Fassler’s comment and added, “I definitely urge patience as long as possible with the caveat that we remember it is not awesome to send adjuncts into new preps without adequate prep time.”

MINUTES

J. Stover thanked A. Donegan for noticing prior to the meeting that the March 3 minutes links were not working, and stated that the correction had been made.

A. Donegan requested that the event title, “Debunking the Myth of Racism in the Criminal Justice System,” be added to her summary statement; as well as the inclusion of: “I emailed Student Services asking what Mr. Breen’s credentials were, specifically asking why is he an expert on this topic? After 3 rounds of emails, Student Services was never able to tell me why Mr. Breen is an expert on this topic.”

J. Bush moved to approve the minutes with the proposed amendments. L. Nahas seconded the motion. A roll-call vote was called, and the March 3 minutes were adopted as amended with 25 Yes votes.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

REPORTS

1. President’s Report – J. Thompson expressed thanks to Vice President Ohkubo and Senate Executive Committee members for stepping in at the last minute at the previous meeting; congratulated the Senate on their teamwork moving through the last meeting’s agenda; reminded Senators about the upcoming training on Friday, March 19, with Laura Schulkind, thanked those who are able to attend, and recognized and honored the amount of work everyone is carrying at the same time; appreciated the quality and thoughtfulness of the CoP proposals; confirmed that all faculty member proposals had been approved; encouraged Senators to participate; and expressed gratitude to Dr. Robert Holcomb, Dr. Jane Saldaña-Talley, and Dr. Frank Chong for supporting and funding the CoPs.

President Thompson shared final thoughts regarding workload, exhaustion, kindness, patience, nonjudgment, and self-care; hoped everyone could take care of themselves over the break so they come back ready for the last half of the semester; stated that “things will fall through the cracks and it is OK, we are all doing something that is not sustainable and we have so far done it with a lot of grace”; ended by thanking the Senate “for doing such extraordinary work during such a difficult year.” [Read J. Thompson’s Full report here.](#)

2. Officer of Equity L. Servais asked, “So what do we mean when we use the word *equity*? I worry sometimes that equity serves as a floating signifier, a word that points to no object, and that has no agreed-upon meaning. The word *equity* shows up in many places in conversations across the District. But I fear, without a clear understanding and shared definition of what equity means, we’re coopting equity to suit our own purposes, thereby stripping equity of its power to transform and preventing us from ending gaps and opportunities and outcomes for students.” L. Servais introduced two definitions of “equity”

(see also [Step Up and Lead for Equity](#) and [The Glossary of Education Reform](#)); linked “equity” to the actions taken in addressing gaps in opportunity and outcomes, and as an action aligned with achieving equality; posed three questions the District needs to be asked: (1) What are our gaps in opportunities and outcomes?; (2) What is fair and just?; and (3) How are we centering learning?; and recognized there will be hard conversations around equity at the College that will ask us to “lean in” on multiple fronts and pointed out that work could not be done as long as “equity” remained a floating signifier. [Read L. Servais’s full report here.](#)

3. L. Aspinall, Chair of the Senate Workgroup on Board Policy 8.2.9/P, Student Educational Rights and Privacy, reported out by providing background on the current policy, which was last updated in 2012, and the formation of the workgroup; noting that the workgroup began meeting in February and has collectively determined the current draft “requires a bit more work before it will be ready for Senate review”; identifying multiple areas of continued research work including, but not limited to, how SRJC defines “directory information”; to whom and how student information is released; when and how information is shared with District Police; how to address in policy recordings of class meetings on platforms such as Zoom; and how other student privacy topics, beyond the scope of FERPA, should be addressed in policy (such as proctoring software). Collected research and information by the workgroup will include: what student data is currently being releasing by SRJC and to whom; a review of other colleges’ student privacy and student records policies for language to use; and the utilization of the California League of Community College’s Policies and Procedures template as a starting point.

Senator comments identified the importance of students and faculty being informed once the policy and procedure is finalized as this has often been left out of discussions in the past. L. Aspinall shared that that conversation has already begun within the workgroup, and once the policy is approved, implementation would involve IT support to inform students what opt-in/opt-out means. M. Leahy, Admissions and Records, added that the website <https://admissions.santarosa.edu/ferpa> contains FERPA information for parents, students and faculty to access, and expressed an interest in extending to faculty the ability to see if a student said “yes” to release their directory information. [See L. Aspinall’s presentation here.](#)

CONSENT

None.

ACTION

None.

DISCUSSION

None.

INFORMATION

1. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Spring 2021 Resolutions
J. Thompson introduced the topic by stating that Senate Exec has made this a priority for the Spring; noted the newly posted draft resolutions will be discussed at the upcoming Area Meetings and eventually voted on at Spring Plenary; indicated that SRJC is Area B, which will meet on Friday, March 26; explained that senators from across the state will comment and ask clarifying questions about resolutions at Area Meetings, which are then considered by the authors/co-authors in the next round of drafts; and pointed out that additional debate and opportunities to offer amendments will take place at Plenary prior to voting.

D. Mezzera, the Senate's Parliamentarian support, expressed concern that all 15 resolutions were placed as Consent items as opposed to a quarter or a third, as has been done in the past; advised to pull a resolution from the consent calendar if any comments, discussion or debate is wanted for any of the resolutions; and suggested contacting the senate delegate for any requests regarding debate, discussions, questions, etc.

Senators discussed the importance of reviewing these items to determine if further debate is needed at these sessions and the added advantage of the smaller packet allowing this to be accomplished in a relatively short amount of time; requested a line of communication for feedback between Senators during Plenary to ensure adequate representation; brought attention to specific resolutions important to ongoing discussions in the Senate: on page 2, item 5.01 "Support for Additional Guided Pathways Funding" is seeking an additional 5 years of funding from the Chancellor's Office; on page 6, items 9.01 "Develop a Set of Resources to Assist in Establishing Ethnic Studies Programs in Alignment with California State University Requirements" and 9.02 "Develop a Rubric for Ethnic Studies Courses and Ethnic Studies or Cultural Awareness Competencies" relate to the development of Ethnic Studies curriculum; and on page 3, item 6.01 "Revisiting the 50% Law and the FON" has potential impacts locally.

Additional Senator discussion clarified that resolutions can be pulled, or added, for discussion at the Area Meetings; encouraged senators to attend the upcoming Area Meeting and share this information with constituents for feedback before Plenary.

D. Mezzera acknowledged a procedural difference at Area Meetings where a Consent item can pass without objection, rather than everybody approving; noted that an item can be pulled from Consent to conduct a unanimous "yes" vote as a show to the Chancellor that senators are not only accepting the item but are strongly in favor of the item.

J. Thompson requested the Senate review the resolutions as they are able, share their comments with the Senate Exec, and inform them if they will be attending the Area Meeting.

2. Academic Senate Constitution Workgroup

J. Thompson opened the topic by noting the importance of updating the Constitution first in order to make much needed updates to the Bylaws; introduced Vice President M. Ohkubo and Executive Secretary J. Stover as co-facilitators; introduced workgroup members J. Carlin-Goldberg, A. Donegan, K. Valenzuela, J. Fassler, and T. Jacobson; and noted that today would be the start of an ongoing discussion.

Senators' comments included: prioritizing revision of Article 5, Section 2 to include language regarding a specific timeline for filling senator vacancies to replace "as soon as possible"; clarifying the voting process for Senators in relation to the Executive Committee; updating the number of Areas and Senators; clarifying the difference between "initiatives" (anything the College is currently working on or voting on) and "referendums"; the suggestion that a list of definitions be developed for added clarity with specific terminology; request for information on the future plan of handling the Bylaws and if individual voting will be needed in order to finalize; confirmation that the Constitution would be reviewed and worked on first, but recognition that there may be some urgent matters within the Bylaws that require attention; adding a recommendation that once the Constitution group has agreed upon the Constitution language and the Senate has voted on the Constitution, that it immediately move into the hands of a Bylaws group so that the Constitution and Bylaws are in alignment; and further clarification that Constitutional changes require the whole electorate.

Additional Senators' comments agreed on tracking changes of the Constitution as it is revised so that both versions are available during the process, as well as later when reviewing the Bylaws; noted that the Bylaws can be attended to by the Senate and do not require the whole electorate to change; and suggested adding more to the Constitution such

as points on student learning and the role of faculty.

J. Stover asked workgroup members to look out for an email so that they could set up a time for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

4:28 p.m.