



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: September 7, 2022
TIME: 3:15 p.m.
LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini
Senate Chambers
Petaluma, 628 Call Bldg.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808
<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/95846273808>

PRESENT

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Avasthi, V. Bertsch, S. Brumbaugh, J. Bush, J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, W. Downey, J. Fassler, G. Garcia, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, N. Persons, B. Reaves, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, N. Slovak, J. Stover, J. Thompson, P. Usina

ABSENT

P. Ozbirinci (Proxy S. Cavales Doolan), W. Downey (Proxy J. Bush), G. Garcia (Proxy J. Stover)

GUESTS

R. Holcomb, J. Smotherman

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President N. Persons. The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by L. Aspinall.

OPEN FORUM

1. N. Slovak commented on the need for developing meaningful evaluation criteria for online classes; stated that the college currently requires training for faculty who wish to teach online classes, which clearly shows that the college acknowledges the difference between teaching online versus in-person teaching; asked why then do faculty use in-person evaluation processes to gauge the effectiveness of online instruction; also noted that it is not enough to create a one-size fits all for online evaluation as there are different forms of online instruction; and encouraged the Senate to take up this issue as soon as possible.
2. G. Morre read a statement on behalf of Sara Jones from the Mathematics Department regarding the Mission, Vision, and Values (MVV) statement as recently brought forth by the College, which read, in part, "The 2022 SRJC Mission and Values statement is missing and misrepresenting some of the core purposes and goals of the college; we provide career and technical education not just for student who plan to transfer, but also for students who want certificates and AA and AS degrees; many students attend SRJC and receive crucial foundational skills and never transfer, get certificates or degrees, and yet they do succeed at improving the trajectory of their lives; our courses and programs are a valuable resource for all of our students."
[Read S. Jones' full statement here.](#)
3. A. Forrester commented on the MVV Statement as recently proposed by the District; thanked the Academic Senate for putting this item on the agenda; supported amending the Mission statement to include anti-racism stances; acknowledged achieving the mission both requires exceptional instruction and exceptional student support services; felt that the explicit mention of the types of programs that are offered at SRJC in place of a commitment to education in general is problematic and alienating; and shared the example of a yoga class she took as an undergraduate, which was not a requirement for her degree and provided integral mental and physical health not only as a student but also throughout adulthood.

MINUTES

None.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

REPORTS

1. President's Report — N. Persons

President Person's report included highlights about College Council, the draft Mission, Vision, and Values statements, the strategic planning process, the first meeting of the Enrollment Management Work Group and its associated challenges, and 2021-22 legislative bills of note that are awaiting the governor's signature include [AB 2315 \(Arambula\)](#), a FACCC-sponsored bill that would require community colleges to allow students, faculty, and staff to use their chosen name on non-binding documents, and FACCC-opposed [AB 1705 \(Irwin\)](#), which would automatically place most students into transfer level math and English.

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

CONSENT

None.

ACTION

1. Disciplinary Overlap Process – Shall the Academic Senate approve the proposed changes to the Disciplinary Overlap Process section of the Curriculum Writer's Handbook?

A Point of Order was called that we can adjust the agenda if need, and that A. Foster would not be present for questions today.

A clarifying question was asked whether there was an appeals process for those who do not like the outcome of a CRC decision, and President Persons clarified that per A. Foster, the issue could be brought back again the following year.

Further questions were asked regarding the processes for appeal should conflict or disagreement arise as the result of a CRC decision that is not accepted by all involved parties, and it was clarified that any faculty has the right at any time to bring an issue to the Academic Senate and/or bring an issue/topic back to CRC in the following year.

Past President Thompson recommended sending the document back to CRC for edits based on the current conversation, and it was noted that ASEC would do so before bringing the Action item back for discussion.

Out of time, President Persons clarified that would be brought back as an Action Item at the next meeting.

2. SRJC Draft Mission Statement – What shall be the Academic Senate's input regarding the proposed Mission statement?

*“Santa Rosa Junior College transforms the lives of our culturally rich student body, employees, and community by cultivating a welcoming and antiracist environment, centered on social responsibility and cultural awareness. We offer exceptional **teaching and learning in support of** associate degree, certificate, transfer preparation, workforce preparation, and community education programs, integrated with comprehensive student support services.”*

President Persons started the discussion by stating she added this an action item based on multiple requests she had received; placed it as an action item so that, should the Academic Senate (AS) move it forward, the MVV draft could be included on the next board agenda; wanted to leave options available to the Senate; reminded all the item had been a report at the last Senate meeting; and notes there were no further questions or comments at that time.

Senators pointed out that in previous drafts the phrase “nurturing personal growth, social responsibility, and cultural awareness” was crossed out and was not listed in the current mission statement; noted that reports to AS do not have built in time for discussion, which is why it was crucial for this topic to be further agendized; and noted that explicit AS approval was necessary before going to the board.

A point of clarification was asked regarding whether the current MVV could be edited, and it was clarified that the Body is empowered to provide input to Jeremy Smotherman on the Mission Statement, but the Senate’s role was not to wordsmith or heavily alter the draft at present.

Senators commented that all constituents had many opportunities via multiple town hall meetings and Senate reports; noted that while the mission statement is important, we are not looking to it in our everyday teaching; and commented that the wording is sufficient to allow the District to move forward; and felt to act otherwise would unnecessarily slow down the already vetted process.

A clarifying question was asked about the procedure of listing this topic as an action item instead of a discussion item, and whether senators had the option to bring a topic to the senate for discussion.

President Persons clarified her previous statements that any faculty can request to bring a topic to the AS for discussion, that she made the executive decision to place the topic as an action item because of the plan to bring the draft to the Board next week, and a lot of time had already passed since the release of the drafted MVV in which comments could be made. President Persons further noted that comparisons to other processes such as Guided Pathway are not the same based on a variety of factors; that there is not a standard “one size fits all” process by which topics are agendized; that there were no questions or requests to agendize the topic when presented as an Report at the last meeting; and that the AS is not the only governing body who provides input on the MVV.

Senators further commented that the MVV does not need approval by the Senate, which President Persons confirmed and further indicated an endorsement of support is what is being sought and is not officially required.

Time expired on the topic, J. Fassler motion to extend by 4 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Community members were called upon and they noted that the MVV changed from the end of Spring to the beginning of Fall, that the last time the MVV was brought forth to the Senate it had changed again, and that the District should bring new drafts back to the SRJC community anytime there is a change.

President Persons noted that time expired on the topic and that it would be brought back at the next meeting.

A point of order was called that we do not call out specific senators by name and that we speak to the issue and not the person.

A point of clarification was made regarding the allowance of time for discussion on the topic, and it was clarified that there is always time for discussion on Action Items.

DISCUSSION

1. Accreditation Work Group Composition, Scope, Purpose, and Selection - *Shall the Academic Senate (AS) approve/endorse the composition, scope, and purpose of the Accreditation Work Group as described in the supporting document, what shall be the criteria for selection of faculty members to participate, and who shall make the selections to the work group?*

Senators asked for clarification on the “scope” and “goals” of an accreditation workgroup, and VPAA R. Holcomb expressed hope that a workgroup would meet regularly for 12-18 months, provide periodic reports to the Senate, and create solutions for the two compliance requirements of the ACCJC. VPAA R. Holcomb also stated that SRJC must be in compliance with the standards, must implement programs in support of standards, and must report on progress to show improvement of related practices.

Senators commented that processes and requirements for SLOs are already in place but not enforced; stressed the importance of training as related to the disaggregation of data; and stressed that most SRJC faculty are Associate who are under no contract obligation to complete these tasks, which should also be resolved.

President Persons redirected the body back to the question on the table; and confirmed the workgroup should address the implementation of tasks for Associate Faculty.

V. Bertsch made a motion, which was seconded, that the ASEC will recruit faculty to serve on the accreditation workgroup and that ASEC will appoint faculty to workgroup with the goal of achieving representation from the many departments and clusters spanning large and small departments including transfer, career, community education groups; and the ASEC will clarify the scope and purpose of the workgroup.

A point of order was called that this is currently a discussion item and that a motion would have to come first to place it on the Action Agenda.

V. Bertsch withdrew his motion.

A point of clarification was made that this item was placed as a discussion item because the conversation from the prior meeting was very robust, that there were still lingering questions, and that appropriate time for discussion was needed.

Time expired on the Item, J. Carlin Goldberg moved to extend the time by 5 minutes, which was seconded with no opposition.

V. Bertsch motioned to move this Discussion Item to Action for the next meeting, which was seconded.

A point of order was called asking if there was time to “craft a motion” or if a proposal could be made so the body had a basis from which to work in the next meeting related to the current discussion and was unsure if such a request could be made.

Past President Thompson clarified that in the past ASEC, when asked, would utilize notes from a discussion to help craft language that would be on the agenda in the next meeting to help facilitate the work of the Senate as they continued the discussion going forward.

Further clarification was sought on the scope/focus of the current vote, and it was clarified by Secretary Stover and President Persons that the vote was on the move from Discussion to Action for Discussion Item 1 “Accreditation Work Group Composition, Scope, Purpose, and Selection” as it appeared on the current agenda.

President Persons clarified that a motion had been made, that we can take what has been suggested into consideration, there will be time for discussion, and that “we have been asked to bring a draft of a motion based on the conversation that happened today,” stated “we will

have all that to start our discussion next time,” and asked if that was clear to Senators. Several “yes” responses were made, and President Persons asked for the vote to be taken.

The roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed with 25 yes votes and 1 no vote.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Reylea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
V. Bertsch – yes
J. Bush – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes
S. Cavales Doolan –
yes
A. Donegan – yes

W. Downey (Proxy J.
Bush)–yes
J. Fassler – yes
G. Garcia (Proxy J.
Stover)– yes
T. Jacobson – yes
T. Johnson – yes
L. Larsen – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
G. Morre – yes

M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver – no
P. Ozbirinci (Proxy S.
Cavales Doolan) – yes
B. Reaves – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
H. Skoonberg – yes
N. Slovak – yes
J. Stover – yes
P. Usina – yes

INFORMATION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

5:01 p.m.