ACADEMIC SENATE

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

PRESENT

M. Anderman, A. Atilgan Relyea, F. Avila, V. Bertsch, S. Brumbaugh, J. Bush, J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, J. Fassler, B. Flyswithhawks, M. Hale, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, J. Kosten, J. Kmetko, D. Lemmer, B. Reaves, N. Slovak, J. Stover, J. Thompson, K. Valenzuela, S. Whylly, S. Winston

ABSENT   A. Oliver – (Partial Proxy J. Kmetko), E. Schmidt (Proxy S. Whylly), T. Jacobson – (Partial Proxy L. Aspinall), H. Skoonberg (Proxy M. Anderman)

GUESTS   C. Williams, A. Merkel

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 Senator S. Cavales Doolan.

OPEN FORUM

President Thompson began with this statement: "I would like to remind everyone that we are here in community. Please speak to arguments and issues, not individuals or a class of individuals. Personal attacks and profanity are not okay. The Academic Senate provides an important forum for sharing ideas, perspectives, and information. We do not allow inappropriate comments – including attacks of any kind. We will also be enforcing our time limits in the Open Forum – 3 minutes per person and 10 minutes per topic. We thank everyone in our community for adhering to those protocols."

1. H. Vettori, representing the ESL Department, spoke out against of the blinding of applications in the scholarship review process; stated that there was no consideration given to how this would affect ESL students nor was ESL consulted about the change; stated that departments need access to student names in the scholarship process to ensure that ESL students receive ESL scholarships; pointed out the scholarship office has not provided information as to how the vetting process will be conducted; shared that last year there were several applications missing and after communication with the scholarship office, they were able to find some of the missing applications that would not have been identified if the applications had been blinded; stated that there has been conflicting information provided as to why the scholarship process has been blinded; and suggested that the scholarship office should not be making award decisions when they do not know students personally.

2. J. Brock, SGA Officer, spoke in favor of students having a voice and vote on faculty hiring committees, and stated that a lot of SGA officers share the concern that the student body should have a say in who is chosen.

3. D. Carmona Benson, SGA President and speaking on behalf of BSU, expressed the desire for students' vote in faculty hiring; addressed students' fight for their 9+1 rights regarding serving on faculty hiring committees; expressed offense that students will not determine which students will serve on hiring committees; requested that the AS revisit the resolutions and allow SGA to choose students; stated concern about SRJC's record in hiring culturally competent faculty members and attributed this to negative impacts on student retention; and stated that students and faculty need to work together.

4. V. Bertsch spoke against the blinding of scholarships; stated scholarships are much more than money for students, but rather foster the links among students, faculty, and disciplines; pointed

out that in the Engineering Department, recipients receive recognition in from of their peers and loved ones in a yearly award ceremony, which is what scholarships are all about; said each year students know that the path to such recognition was engagement with the program; indicated that non-discipline students show up on the scholarship applicant list and that blinding the names would not allow for corrections.

5. J. Kmetko spoke against the blinding of the scholarship applications; stated that at previous institutions the scholarship process lay with each academic department; understands that the process is different for SRJC, where the sole control of the application process lies with the scholarship office; stated that academic scholarship processes should belong to departments; reported that the VP of Student Services told him and others that the Foundation would retain control of the process; stressed that the new process makes it more difficult to address inequities; and stated that knowing the identity of the students allows faculty to make corrections to ongoing assessment strategies.

6. M. Von der Porten spoke in regards to public access to the accreditation process; stated that SRJC has achieved its accreditation process without a single public comment being reviewed or evaluated; commented on the difficulty of the public to discover information about the accreditation process and submit third-party comments; claimed that the Board was asked about the way of submitting comments straight to SRJC and requested a summary of the ISER and nothing ever came of it; critiqued lack of public outreach on the SRJC website, resulting in very few public comments, which were never forwarded to SRJC or incorporated in the process; stated that there was not a way for the public to participate in meetings because none of the process was open to anyone outside of the College; and stated that the public contributes to the College's funding and should therefore be a part of those discussions.

MINUTES

None

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

REPORTS

1. President's Report — J. Thompson

    President Thompson announced that Vice President of Student Services P. Avila, Foundation Executive Director J. Mullineaux, and concerned faculty members will be meeting to discuss concerns about the blinding of scholarship applications; stated that the 2022 Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption assessment has been submitted to the Chancellor's Office and will be posted on the Senator Resources webpage, and thanked Matthew Long and Stephanie Dirks for their support; acknowledged that GP-related work is being completed by many folks across the College; and thanked all who are contributing to making our college more accessible, more approachable, and more supportive of our diverse student body. J. Thompson reported that College Council held a second retreat to work on the governance redesign and that a third retreat is scheduled for April 7th; noted the need for establishing clear relationships between and among committees, councils, and other bodies, information which is not currently included in a committee's charge; and reported that the work thus far has been collaborative, consensus-based, and demonstrative of extensions of trust among members.

    President Thompson also reported that B. Reaves and N. Persons will be joining her at ASCCC Spring Plenary April 7th thru 9th and asked Senators, if able, to please review the resolutions packet and share thoughts before voting takes place on Saturday; reminded and encouraged faculty that nominations for at-large seats are due no later than 8 a.m. on Monday, April 11; reported attending a meeting on Open Educational Resources and Zero-Textbook-Cost courses

organized by Dean Mary-Catherine Oxford; relayed that discussions yielded the goals of ensuring that more faculty members understand what OER and ZTC are, are aware of available resources, learn how they can integrate these resources into their courses, and are aware of the cost to students of the books and materials we order; noted that the bookstore's textbook adoption email will be soon arriving and requested that faculty members submit orders in a timely manner; thanked temporary Vice President T. Jacobson for her service and welcomed back VP M. Ohkubo, who will return on April 20.

[Read President Thompson's full report here.](#)

2. Job Announcement Taskforce – K. Valenzuela, C. Williams

The Job Announcement Taskforce (JAT) reviewed the Academic Senate's recommendation to solicit comments and ideas from the faculty, research effective practices, and present to the Senate ideas for consideration and possible endorsement; reported the JAT reviewed and analyzed the feedback from the faculty; consolidated, added, and emphasized areas of improvement for the job announcement and identified areas of the job announcement that fall under HR's purview (legal requirements), Department/Discipline's purview, and District's purview; emphasized they developed ideas and suggestions, not requirements, to improve the job announcement such as consolidating language, making the language friendlier, and using sincere, neutral-based dialogue; mentioned other suggestions for departments to emphasize ways perspective faculty can connect through projects, committee work, and conferences, specify the department expectations (within the definition of Job Description found in the AFA Contract), stress discipline expertise, and define "currency in field" within the discipline; suggested the District provide a picture for perspective faculty regarding the diverse student body population, programs (HSI, certificate programs, etc.), the Strategic Plan, and sustainability; emphasized that the diversity prompt (minimum qualification) needs to be updated; and indicated completion of their charge and an official pass back to Senate.

[Read K. Valenzuela and C. Williams' full report here.](#)

3. HSI Grant and Partner with Sonoma State University on "Soft Handoff" of Transfers – A. Merkel

A. Merkel reported that the District is looking at a HSI grant in collaboration with Sonoma State University (SSU) and there are approximately 400 students that transfer to SSU each year but there is a good percentage of students who do not; mentioned students could not be transferring due to high costs of housing and tuition; advocated that the collaboration would allow us to keep students local; reported the grant is $600,000 annually for five years with an application due date of June 2022 and start date of October 2022; outlined goals of (1) outreach and awareness, (2) increase Latinx student transfers to SSU, and (3) soft handoff to SSU; and reported this as a great opportunity for our students to collaborate with SSU.

[See A. Merkel's full presentation here.](#)

CONSENT

None

ACTION

1. What shall be the Senate's recommendation(s) regarding composition of screening and interviewing committees?

President Thompson opened the conversation by acknowledging the large portion of work completed last week; reminded that a previous Senate body made decisions about the section under review now and to make constructive comments working towards resolution; and asked Senators to hear other's perspectives, disciplinary needs, and areas of common ground.

Senators commented on the Section III language regarding emeritus faculty; suggested the

term "emeritus" faculty members be replaced with "associate" faculty member; noted that the AFA contract does not specify a specific class of faculty as "emeritus;" suggested removing the language that students cannot be a voting member of the hiring committee as per previous AS decisions; asked that the term "adjunct" be changed to "associate;" questioned why both the AS President (ASP) and the VP of Academic Affairs (VPAA) were to be sought in the approval process was answered in that it was originally written to ensure there were no conflicts of interest; expressed confusion regarding the document in the current meeting materials as not having been updated to reflect changes adopted at the last meeting; and suggested taking the documents line by line instead of as a whole.

Past President B. Flyswithhawks reminded the AS what has been approved in the last few meetings and to not vote to approve something that is in conflict with what has been approved.

President Thompson suggested a short 2-minute recess after the break to review Section III, 4.3.2P Mark-Up Draft (May 6, 2020) and 4.3.2P Section III Screening & Interviewing Committee Support Document 2022 02 02 as based on the slow discussion start; reviewed and pasted into the chat the perfected language approved at the last meeting regarding student participation in faculty hiring that reads: "Departments will select student(s) for meaningful and measurable participation in the options including but are not limited to: / • Teaching demonstration participation / • Skills demonstration participation / • Member of the screening and interview committee / • Structured conversations or moderated Q&As with candidates / • Student survey or poll. For all methods of student involvement, committees will be responsible for ensuring student input is given equivalent consideration as the input of any other member of the hiring committee"; and senators suggested working solely from the 4.3.2P Mark-Up Draft (May 6, 2020) and approve section by section.

Senator A. Donegan made a motion to approve parts 1 and 2 of Section 3: Screening and Interview Committees and no second was made.

A point of order was called citing the language that has already been adopted by the AS; needed clarification on whether the AS needed to vote on it again "as a whole" or by amendment; and President Thompson clarified that there was a previous 2/3 vote that decided if there were no changes, the body can just move to the next section.

A point of order was called that there should not be a motion called since this is a discussion item, and President Thompson clarified that this is an Action Item and motions can be made.

Senators continued the conversations on Section III, points 1 and 2; suggested adding language regarding the need to evaluate the discipline expertise of the candidates; and mentioned it is implicit in the policy but should also be made explicit.

Senator K. Valenzuela made a motion to approve parts 1 and 2 of "Section III: Screening and Interview Committees" with the amendment to include evaluation of discipline expertise, and Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg seconded.

A roll-call vote was called and the motion passes with 25 yes votes and 1 absence as amended.

M. Anderman – yes	J. Fassler – yes	E. Schmidt (proxy S. Whylly) – yes
L. Aspinall – yes	M. Hale – yes	
A. Atilgan-Reylea – yes	T. Jacobson (proxy L. Aspinall) – yes	H. Skoonberg (proxy M. Anderman) – yes
F. Avila – yes		
V. Bertsch – yes	T. Johnson – yes	N. Slovak – yes
S. Brumbaugh – yes	J. Kosten – yes	J. Stover – yes
J. Bush – yes	J. Kmetko – absent	K. Valenzuela – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	D. Lemmer – yes	S. Whylly – yes
S. Cavales Doolan –yes	A. Oliver – yes	S. Winston – yes
A. Donegan – yes	B. Reaves – yes	

Moving on to Section III, part three, senators reviewed that the number of faculty (6) was not the will of the Senate and should be reevaluated; President Thompson recollected that was a straw-poll vote to determine the bullet points first with follow up on the specific number and a formal vote still needed; and noted it is an unresolved question requiring resolution by the AS.

President Thompson asked if there were any objections to bullet point 1: The Department Chair or Program Director, or designee, and there were no objections heard; and asked if there were any objections to bullet point 2: Three (3) or more additional full-time faculty members from the department where the vacancy exists or related discipline(s). Senators noted whenever possible, Petaluma faculty member(s) should be included when the position is designated for Petaluma; argued against putting a specific number on full-time faculty participation as some departments may not have three full-time faculty and suggested changing "up to three"; other; and shared that looking at the other bullet points should be taken into consideration before lowering the number of full-time discipline-specific faculty because it risks the discipline not having the majority vote on the hiring committee.

President Thompson suggested that if the AS needs more time they could choose to come back to this bullet point and move on to the next. Senators continued the discussion noting that while smaller departments may have three faculty, in large departments you do not want to limit to just 3; suggested changing the verbiage to "Up to 3 if possible" and to make the Petaluma statement a sub-bullet; suggested changing the wording to "Department faculty recommend three or more…"; or " Three or more full-time or associate faculty from the department where the vacancy exists or related disciplines wherever possible"; and suggested using a discipline associate faculty in lieu of a full-time faculty in the event that the department does not have enough full-time faculty.

Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg made a motion to direct the Executive Committee to create wording, based on the present discussion, to include the possibility of having fewer than three department faculty while encouraging that hiring committees have at least three full time department faculty on Hiring Committees; Senator S. Whylly seconded.

Senators argued against the motion protesting the repeated deferral to the Executive Committee; stated AS should be making those decisions in meetings as part of their expected work; expressed concerns that ASEC will make something only to be rejected by the AS Body which prolongs the process; and clarified the purpose of the motion was to enable the ASEC fully documented the expressed spirit of the discussion and also would save meeting time.

President Thompson announced that time had expired, and a point of order was made that there was a motion on the floor with a second, and the Senate needed to take a vote.

A roll-call vote was called and the motion failed with 14 no votes and 12 yes votes.

M. Anderman – no	J. Fassler – yes	yes
L. Aspinall – no	M. Hale – no	H. Skoonberg (proxy M.
A. Atilgan-Reylea – no	T. Jacobson – no	Anderman) – no
F. Avila – no	T. Johnson – no	N. Slovak – no
V. Bertsch – yes	J. Kosten – yes	J. Stover – yes
S. Brumbaugh – yes	J. Kmetko – yes	K. Valenzuela – yes
J. Bush – no	D. Lemmer – yes	S. Whylly – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	A. Oliver – no	S. Winston – no
S. Cavales Doolan – no	B. Reaves – no	
A. Donegan – yes	E. Schmidt (proxy S. Whylly) –	

DISCUSSION

None

INFORMATION

1. Faculty Recruitment, Screening, and Hiring Data – G. Durand and S. Hopkins, 10 min.

   VP of HR G. Durand and HR Director S. Hopkins reported out the current faculty ethnicity and diversity data; noted their goal of providing an annual report to the Board by employee group— Contract Faculty, Associate Faculty, Classified Professionals, and Management—every fall: acknowledged that annual reports will be coalesced into a five 5-year longitudinal study; acknowledged that individuals that identify as multi-racial can be listed as an additional category, but the current report only asks individuals for one race as based on external Title V parameters; anticipated the full presentation will be information on initiatives, successes; and opportunities; noted the report will also include the diversity percentages for each group / category; and welcomed questions for the remainder of their time.

   Senator J. Kmetko read a statement on behalf of President-Elect N. Persons:

   I feel this report does not provide us with the breadth or depth of information we need in order to understand how well we are doing at diversifying our faculty. In sessions at the Equity Academy and the Association of Hispanic Serving Institutions Educators conference (AHSIE 2021) it was strongly encouraged to report disaggregated DEI data on the following steps in the faculty hiring process (and then merge them to maintain confidentiality). The steps in hiring where the data should be reported and the manner in which it should be presented include:

   - *Disaggregated data on individuals applying for positions broken down by ethnicity/race*

   - *Disaggregated data on individuals advanced past "paper" screening and invited to interview broken down by ethnicity/race*

   - *Disaggregated data on individuals making it to the finalist group by ethnicity/race*

   - *Disaggregated data on individuals chosen for the position (as a total group) by ethnicity/race*

   - *These data should be presented alongside the related year of student data, also disaggregated, and the total full-time/part-time faculty disaggregated as well.*

   - *These data should be presented annually, and we need to start by going back several years, not just one or two, I would request 5 years of data, and then to continue reporting these data annually.*

   Senators asked whether the annual report will include STNC and student employees as many departments use these positions primarily, and G. Durand answered that it is something that can be reviewed and depends on the data that is available through the Neo Gov tracking system; clarified that it is very important to providing as much information as possible, and the specifics are available to see if we are maintaining diverse candidates (noting it will also make for a longer report).

   A closing comment from a senator asked how multi-racial folks were being represented in the data, and G. Durand noted individuals were only being asked to identify as one but that could be reviewed in appreciation of folks' agency in identifying with more than one.

   See G. Durand and S. Hopkins' full presentation here.

ADJOURNMENT

5:04 p.m.