



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: May 4, 2022

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Zoom only

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/95846273808>

### PRESENT

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, 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, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, N. Persons, B. Reaves, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, J. Stover, J. Thompson, S. Whylly, S. Winston

**ABSENT** K. Valenzuela

**GUESTS** S. Feldman, D. Frontczak, T. Frongia, K. Smith, E. Dale, J. Paisley, R. Bruenn, N. Hill, R. Romagnoli

### 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. Kmetko.

### OPEN FORUM

1. L. Larque spoke on behalf of the Latinx Faculty and Staff Association (LFSA) President and in relation to the Scholarship Blinding process; stated that the blinding process removes conflict of interest and personal bias and is a good example of empowering student equity; mentioned after the George Floyd assassination, a strong movement demanding Black equality in all aspects of society took place; noted SRJC faces long needed changes, changes that would bring a sense of some equality in the college, and had promised to start bringing the equity question to the table and intentionally carry into practice what has been promised for a long time in theory; understood that there were people expressing concerns on “students of color” not receiving scholarships as a result of the blinding system when the facts proved that was not the case; commented that records show that the number of students of color receiving scholarships has increased as a result of the blinding process; questioned what system, or process, is perfect?; thanked the people involved in scholarships who are working on improving the process; and asked they be provided more time to address concerns before the Academic Senate (AS) take any formal action.

[Read L. Larque’s full statement here](#)

### MINUTES

Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg moved to approve the [April 20](#) minutes; Senator S. Cavales-Doolan seconded the motion. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes with 24 yes votes and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman – yes

L. Aspinall – yes

A. Atilgan Relyea – yes

F. Avila – yes

V. Bertsch – yes

S. Brumbaugh – yes

J. Bush – yes

J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes

S. Cavales Doolan – yes

A. Donegan – yes

J. Fassler – yes

M. Hale – yes

T. Jacobson – yes

T. Johnson – yes

J. Kosten – yes

J. Kmetko – yes

D. Lemmer – yes

M. Ohkubo – yes

A. Oliver – yes

B. Reaves – yes

E. Schmidt – yes

H. Skoonberg (Proxy

Anderman) – yes

J. Stover – yes

K. Valenzuela – absent

S. Whylly – yes

S. Winston – abstain

## ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

## REPORTS

### 1. President's Report – J. Thompson

President Thompson opened with a preview of the Guided Pathways (GP) Workgroup reports, of which four would be reporting today and the fifth on May 18; noted that while we will not be receiving additional funding for GP next year, the Chancellor's Office is allowing colleges additional time, beyond this fiscal year, to complete work and spend down any remaining funds; and noted local completion work can continue over the summer and into fall as needed.

She also reported there will be a short College Council progress report on the governance redesign project at the 5/18/22 AS meeting; announced the progress report will be delivered at a one-hour town hall meeting before the end of the semester (date to be determined); announced that in-person commencement will be held on Saturday, May 28 and referred to Dr. Saldana-Talley's 4/26/22 email which provides a registration link for those interesting in attending in person; announced the district is soliciting interest for two Professional Development Coordinators – a one-year position to fill a mid-term vacancy, starting at the end of this semester, and a two-year term that begins at the start of the Fall 2022 semester; noted the application process is open to tenured faculty members and Year Four probationary faculty members whose tenure, effective Fall 2022, was approved by the Board this spring; announced that applications are due by Monday, May 16, at 5 p.m.; also announced the application deadline for the Teaching Fellows Program has been extended to Monday, May 9 and encouraged folks to reach out to Shawn Brumbaugh, Rachael Cutcher, Katie Gerber, Leon Hsu, Cathy Prince, or President Thomson with any questions; announced the next Strategic Planning Town Hall meeting on Friday, May 13 and urged senators to attend; announced all members of the 2021-2022 Academic Senate are recipients of the Academic Senate President's Award; and stated every member who has served this year has contributed meaningfully and hoped that all will be able to attend the online awards event.

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

### 2. Committee Appointment Process – N. Persons

Recognized the Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) Appointment Group of Byron Reaves, Jessica Bush, Nancy Persons, and Natalia Haworth (Assistant); reviewed principles used in making appointments: respected applicant preferences as much as possible, balanced seasoned and newer voices on committees, strove for diversity of committee membership along gender expression, age, ethnicity, discipline representation, and honored suggested committee makeup as stated in committee charge; reported relevant stats including 90 faculty responded to call for committees out of 287 full-time faculty (55 tenure track and 232 tenured), with 15 retiring this year and 36 new positions starting Fall 2022 (assuming 100% successful recruitments); reported 11 faculty were not appointed, many because they specified only one committee or a committee with no open seats; noted those currently appointed to committees are being notified, and a forthcoming call will solicit interest in filling remaining vacancies; acknowledged a small percentage of faculty perform college wide service work outside of their departments; and stated that if even a fraction of those who did not respond to the call for appointment to a shared governance committee stepped forward to volunteer, it would spread the workload out and increase faculty participation.

[Read N. Person's full report here](#)

### 3. GP: Interdisciplinary FYE Course – A. Donegan, S. Feldman, D. Frontczak

Reviewed that last semester the group surveyed 90 faculty respondents asking which foundational and critical thinking skills they wanted the students to develop in a FYE course; were tasked with developing a first year seminar course outline template tentatively called "College 1: The First Year

Seminar”; highlighted the forthcoming review of the course description by the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), which will read: “This course will strengthen critical thinking and study skills needed for success in college, introduce students to a wide array of student support services, and will inspire academic exploration and civic engagement. Students will be engaged in a particular disciplinary pathway that will ignite intellectual curiosity”; noted the broad disciplinary topics and flexibility to allow any discipline to teach the course; mentioned comparable courses at other colleges, including “UCSB: Discovery Seminars” and “SFSU: First Year Seminars”, which offer a broad range of topics fostering student exploration and deeper understanding; aimed to foster faculty collaboration on topics of interest; and stated that passion is contagious and these courses will introduce students to the disciplines we love.

[Read A. Donegan, S. Feldman, & D. Frontczak’s full report here](#)

4. GP: Student-Facing Website Redesign – T. Frongia, A. Oliver, K. Smith

Reviewed that the iFactory contract is moving forward; announced that the group is in the “Information Architecture and User Experience” phase of the timeline as previously shared; noted discovery phase activities such as strategic questionnaire development, stakeholder interviews, student focus groups, and student surveys were conducted; quoted student feedback regarding the SRJC website, who stated that it is easy to get lost and hard to navigate; reported stakeholder interviews expressed desire for a visual representation for the student journey; shared an example of the student survey that was sent; highlighted that top contact points for students were the Counseling and Financial Aid Departments; noted it was hard to explore areas of study on the current website and students supported change; reported student responses indicated plans to transfer to a 4-year college/university; and reported moving into the next phase which will include reviewing student survey responses, reviewing and editing strategy report, creating User Personas, and designing a visual representation of student journeys within the website.

[See T. Frongia, A. Oliver, & K. Smith’s full presentation here](#)

5. GP: Academic Support Backpacks – E. Dale, M. Hale, J. Paisley

Announced that since the last report, the group has met with departments and groups to ensure they have a comprehensive list of academic supports identified and included; noted the project and resources have been well received by faculty who are enthusiastic at the prospect of an academic support backpack being made available; noted their report represents the group’s official requests for partnership and budget; urged the AS to closely and expediently review; noted the request is to formally partner with Student Services to carry this project to completion; stated that Student Services’ knowledge and background in relevant technology is pivotal to the success of the project; pointed out there is also a specific breakdown of the different technological costs related to the backpack project including programming for website development and design; ensured that these technology requests are within the scope of GP related spending; and requested their project and budget be placed on the next Consent Agenda.

[Read E. Dale, M. Hale, & J. Paisleys full report here](#)

6. GP: FYE Programs – R. Bruenn, N. Hill, B. Reaves, R. Romagnoli

Reviewed the charge provided by AS; developed a list of all programs that SRJC offers and separated them into categories that will be easily accessible to students; stated the current website does not use student-centered language and not all students understand college service terms like Financial Aid, Counseling, etc.; reported they are determining where to best position online FYE Program links; shared ideas for using student friendly language to categorize support links such as “Learn about SRJC”, “Get Help Finding Your Path”, “Get Involved”, “Get Ready to Take Classes”, “Find Free Resources”, “Get Help with Your Classes”; and reviewed design ideas from other schools in search of new, more streamlined ways of providing information to students.

[See R. Bruenn, N. Hill, B. Reaves, & R. Romagnoli's full presentation here](#)

## CONSENT

1. Change of Signatories, Exchange Bank Accounts to remove Julie Thompson effective May 28, 2022 and add Nancy Persons effective May 29, 2022.

A roll-call vote was called, and the consent item is approved with 25 unanimous “yes” votes.

## ACTION

1. Faculty Hiring Procedure 4.3.2P, Composition of Screening and Interviewing Committees (SIC) (Ed. Code 87360) – What shall be the Senate’s recommendation(s) regarding composition of screening and interviewing committees?

President Thompson acknowledged that Senator E. Schmidt was in the queue from the prior meeting; stated that she had something individually to say regarding the composition of SIC recommendation; and passed the gavel to Vice President M. Ohkubo who started the discussion.

A senator started the conversation with requests that the Senate use appropriate terms for “contract” and “regular” faculty within the document; also suggested that the terms “voting” or “non-voting” should be changed to reflect that the hiring committees do not vote, but rather score.

President Thompson presented a [draft document](#) representing a reworking of [Section III of the Faculty Hiring Procedure 4.3.2P, Composition of Screening and Interviewing Committees](#) in support of moving the Senate’s process forward; reiterated that she will not argue or advocate for the document, but rather wanted to offer it to the AS as something that may be helpful; noted she created three sub-sections within Section III to better categorize the information; and worked the AS’s value statement into the policy and applied it as a general provision as a guide as to how the committees are put together.

Vice President M. Ohkubo then passed the gavel back to President Thompson to facilitate the remainder of the meeting.

A senator noted that they would need time to read through the newly presented document, and President Thompson asked, procedurally, whether she could email something to senators outside of the meeting.

A point of order was made suggesting President Thompson upload the document into the zoom chat as a file, which she then did; and President Thompson proposed that the Senate be given ten minutes time to read over the document.

A point of order was called that there was only 22 minutes left for this topic and suggested five minutes for reading followed by discussion; President Thompson agreed, and five minutes of silent reading followed.

Senators asked clarifying questions about the proposed language and regarding the minimum amount of faculty to be included, and it was clarified that there would be 6; noticed that guests were not included in the new draft; asked a clarifying question regarding whether students should be in the “will be” portion of the draft and not the “may”; clarified that the Senate did not make a decision regarding a guest representation; clarified that regarding students, the language that was previously voted on was for students to be included in the faculty hiring process, which included hiring committee participation, but ultimately left the decision up to the committee/hiring department; questioned if the cluster supervisor / administrator was considered a requirement, which was confirmed; made suggestions for the supervising administrator or the instructional dean as an “either/or” option instead of requiring both.

Past-President Flyswithhawks suggested changing the language from “voting members” to “full participation members” as the discussion has come up multiple times previously; noted that there does not seem to be a guarantee of DEIA language; and asked the AS to consider language

ensuring affinity group representation.

Senators suggested including language that prohibits access to private information on applications when students are chosen to participate on a hiring committee; suggested that when hiring an associate faculty member that the option of “may include” is given to a supervising administrator; suggested including “retired faculty” as specifically helpful to disciplines with few/no full-time faculty.

A question was asked if it was required for a district compliance monitor to be a part of the hiring committee for both contract and adjunct faculty, which the President confirmed; and noted that in associate faculty hiring, the supervising administrator is also usually serving as compliance monitor.

The question was asked again on whether students shall be included on faculty hiring committees; and President Thompson clarified that students will participate in the Faculty Hiring process with multiple choices on how that could happen, not that students will be required to participate in hiring committees specifically, and that the current language being considered is for the SIC specifically.

Time expired on the Action Item with no senators in the queue.

## DISCUSSION

1. Faculty and Department Perspectives on Scholarship Review Process (5, 6) – Shall the Academic Senate address the blinding of applications and its relationship to equitable distribution of scholarships?

President Thompson opened the conversation by acknowledging that many conversations have already transpired regarding the blinding of the scholarship process; acknowledged per the bylaws the ASEC recognized the request to agendaize this topic from Senators A. Oliver and J. Kmetko; and confirmed Senators A. Oliver and J. Kmetko would speak first as originators of the topic.

Senator Oliver thanked the ASEC for placing the topic on the agenda; spoke to the need for shared governance and her related experience with the ESL scholarship process; read a statement expressing concerns ESL scholarships were being awarded to unqualified students while eligible students were being excluded; stated that the Scholarship Office changed the ESL preferences without consulting the department and disqualified students for inequitable reasons; noted all of her students who applied for the John Jordan Scholarship were excluded, even though it is a scholarship specifically for ESL students; reported the Scholarship Office limited applications to students who have attended in the last two years only, which is an equity issue as it eliminated any ESL student who left SRJC due to a lack of technological skills and/or COVID related issues; stated the Scholarship Office has since corrected many of the concerns listed, but it took the faculty having to contact them multiple times for corrections to occur; and requested faculty inclusion in decision making processes and shared governance going forward.

[Read Senator A. Oliver's full statement here](#)

Senator Kmetko expressed his appreciation for and positive, ongoing collaboration with the Scholarship Office; stated that faculty input should be included in choices related to software platforms used for scholarship review; asked the administration to provide opportunities for regular faculty feedback on their experience with scholarship reviews and also consult with faculty on how scholarships are configured, including decisions on which types of scholarships are blinded and/or merit based; stated there is no transparency in the current process; and asked the administration to provide annual reports on the statistics reflecting student experience with the software platform, including the number of attempted but unfinished student applications that would indicate possible student success barriers.

Senators joined the conversation with an example that for a baseball scholarship you have to be a baseball player, which is something that needs to be verified before determining scholarship eligibility; stated the importance of departmental expertise, an example of which is that the Math department blinded their scholarships on their own within their department and the diversity was not

what they thought it would be, with no students of color selected and only one woman; and argued that when the students are known, there is a better chance to making sure that the scholarship winners are a better representation of the student body.

A Senator made the statement that the AS needs to reach an agreement on the standard operational definitions of equity and diversity; stated that current use of the terms are being used too loosely; asked that the AS come with solutions instead of finger pointing; stated as an example that there are some black students at SRJC that leave the college never applying for scholarships because they think that they wont get selected based on the color of their skin, which statistic supports; and expressed desire for problem-solving.

A suggestion was made that there should be designated people in the Scholarship Office or Scholarship Committees who would be able to see the full spectrum of identifying information on the application, including names, to double check and verify that eligible students are not unfairly being excluded; and acknowledged that the scholarship system is not perfect.

A Senator pointed out that implicit bias is real; that the blinding of the scholarships was likely implemented as a matter of equity and to prevent implicit bias; that implicit bias exists and provided an example that studies have shown when you send out the same resume with 100 white-sounding names and 100 black-sounding names, the resumes with white-sounding names get call backs, interviews, and job offers far more often than the resumes with black-sounding names. Other Senators called for solutions and partnership with the Scholarship Office on behalf of the faculty; expressed concern there are still so many merit-based scholarships, when students who are high achieving will find resources, whereas there are many students who have very limited resources from which to draw; stated students need support from the College; and encouraged faculty to think about the purpose of scholarships.

#### **INFORMATION**

None.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

5:02 p.m.