



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: September 21, 2022  
 TIME: 3:15 p.m.  
 LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini  
 Senate Chambers & Doyle 144  
 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, D. Lemmer, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, P. Ozbirinci, N. Persons, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, N. Slovak, J. Stover, P. Usina

**ABSENT** L. Larsen (Proxy D. Lemmer)

**GUESTS** A. Forrester, A. Foster, R. Holcomb

### 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 J. Carlin-Goldberg.

### OPEN FORUM

1. T. Melvin expressed opposition to the Mission Vision Values (MVV) statement set forth by the District as specific to the phrase “We offer exceptional teaching and learning in support of associate degree, certificate, transfer preparation...” as based on the inability to offer remedial Math and English classes that support associate degrees, certificates, and transfer preparation per the Chancellor’s office and forthcoming legislation AB1705.  
[Read T. Melvin’s full statement here.](#)
2. J. Thompson announced her resignation as Past President effective 9/22/22; stated how much she has appreciated the opportunity to serve the faculty in the positions she has held; expressed gratitude for the work of the AS; affirmed that the two most important things the AS does are purview and process; and reaffirmed that when we are diligent in protecting purview then the AS is doing right by the faculty.
3. J. Stover thanked J. Thompson for her service; and thanked N. Haworth for her service as Administrative Assistant since January 2022, stated that he has grown quite fond of her in a short amount of time, and that we can expect amazing things from her in the future.

### MINUTES

Senator Donegan requested that there be more detail on the ideas of representation on the Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) on page 4 of the August 31 minutes and that they should include different types of faculty positions as well as race and gender diversity aspects.

Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg moved to approve the minutes from August 31 as amended and September 7 minutes as presented, which was seconded. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes as amended (8/31) and presented (9/07) with 25 yes votes and 1 absence as follows:

M. Anderman – yes	W. Downey – yes	A. Oliver – yes
L. Aspinall – yes	J. Fassler – yes	P. Ozbirinci – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – absent	G. Garcia – yes	E. Schmidt – yes
S. Avasthi – yes	T. Jacobson – yes	H. Skoonberg – yes
V. Bertsch – yes	T. Johnson – yes	N. Slovak – yes
J. Bush – yes	L. Larsen (proxy D. Lemmer) – yes	J. Stover – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	D. Lemmer – yes	P. Usina – yes
S. Cavales Doolan – yes	G. Morre – yes	
A. Donegan – yes	M. Ohkubo – yes	

## ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

## REPORTS

### 1. President's Report — N. Persons

President Persons reminded Senators the ASEC meets every Thursday morning from 8:30 – 10 a.m. and that folks are always welcomed to join; offered to schedule those who wished to speak; announced that Byron Reaves, Area 1 Senator and Equity Advocate, and Julie Thompson, Past President, have both resigned from their positions within the AS/ASEC and thanked them both for their contributions and expertise; and highlighted the work and needs of several standing committees including the Educational Planning & Coordinating Council (EPCC) (which needs one more faculty appointment), College Council (CC), Planning and Budget Council (PBC), Faculty Staffing Committee, Strategic Planning, Guided Pathways, and Enrollment Management, and; ended with the call for proposals to the 2022-23 Communities of Practice focused on themes related to IDEAA principles and inclusive of an H.S.I. STEM Grant to solicit proposals for STEM/Health Sciences field-specific CoPs also focused on Equity-related principles.

[Read N. Persons fully detailed report here.](#)

### 2. Professional Development Coordinators (PDCs) Update – A. Donegan, A. Forrester

PDCs A. Donegan and A. Forrester shared relevant news and updates as specific to PDA Days and DEIA offerings, “Forever Flex” and discipline-specific development options, AFA related needs as specific to mandatory trainings, New Faculty Orientation (NFO) updates and activities, and the challenges new faculty are facing, including, but not limited to, statewide bureaucracies, our antiquated SIS system, and pandemic-related disruptions and low enrollments. They ended the report by stating that they hoped to continue working with the AS via meetings with ASEC to ensure the new faculty professional development program is aligned with the Senate’s aim to serve our new faculty well.

[Read A. Donegan & A. Forrester’s fully detailed report here.](#)

## CONSENT

None.

## ACTION

### 1. SRJC Draft Mission Statement – What shall be the Academic Senate’s (AS) input regarding the proposed Mission Statement?

President Persons opened the topic by stating that whatever input or comment is given by the Senate will be communicated back to the Board in form of a report given at the Board Meeting in October and reminded all they can also speak directly to the Board.

Senators started the conversation by pointing out in prior meetings it was stated that the Mission Statement was not pertinent as most do not read it, but is important as future employees read for employment; suggested that it should be centered around learning and professional skill development as an educational institution; suggested that the antiracist statement should be put into the values rather than the mission statement; noted there is currently no mention of personal growth or lifelong learning; agreed with open forum comments that SRJC does not offer quality education or support since the imposed eliminations of below college level math and English courses by the State of California.

A senator suggested the MVV falls under the AS legal purview to advise the board on academic issues under the 10+1 as “degree and certificate requirements.” Other Senators suggested

adding 'diverse' to "culturally rich 'and diverse' student body"; suggested that it should state that SRJC should "aim" to transform instead; suggested it should be aspirational and not what we are doing right now; and suggested using infinitives as specific to the "is to transform the lives of" phrase.

A point of order was called, stating that action should be taken if it was placed on the Action Agenda; President Persons clarified that she had made an executive decision to add this to the action item at the last meeting so that a senator could make a motion to endorse the Mission statement if they so choose.

A point of clarification inquired if the AS was to use this time to review the Mission Statement with the option to continue the conversation for input or choose to make a motion to endorse the Mission Statement, and this understanding was clarified as correct.

Senators spoke in favor of sending input for the Board to use infinitives in the Mission Statement to further align with what SRJC is doing and as specific to the open forum statement concerning the lack of below college level course offerings in math and English.

Senator J. Fassler moved, which was seconded, to recommend to the Board that the Mission Statement of SRJC is "to transform", using infinitives, for the statement to read as follows:

The mission of the Sonoma County Junior College District is: ~~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.

A point of clarification inquired whether AS has the power to revise the Mission Statement or rather just provide recommendations to the Board, which was clarified as the latter.

A senator spoke against the motion because statements of this type are speaking from the future as if the task has already been achieved; senators spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the infinitives should also live in the beginning section of the MVV where it states: "The mission of the Sonoma County Junior College District is".

A. Donegan moved to extend for 4 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

A senator expressed appreciation that the Mission Statement has come through College Council twice, but asked that the full Mission, Vision, and Values Statements should go through the AS before going to College Council again for endorsement; feels that it is crucial that the AS should be given the opportunity to discuss the statements thoroughly.

A roll-call vote was called, and the motion passed with 20 yes votes and 5 no votes as follows:

M. Anderman – yes	W. Downey – yes	M. Ohkubo – yes
L. Aspinall – yes	J. Fassler – yes	A. Oliver – yes
A. Atilgan Reylea – yes	G. Garcia – yes	P. Ozbirinci – yes
S. Avasthi – no	T. Jacobson – yes	E. Schmidt – no
V. Bertsch – yes	T. Johnson – yes	H. Skoonberg – yes
J. Bush – yes	L. Larsen (proxy D. Lemmer) – no	N. Slovak – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	D. Lemmer – no	J. Stover – no
S. Cavales Doolan – yes	G. Morre – yes	P. Usina – yes
A. Donegan – yes		

2. Disciplinary Overlap Process – Shall the AS approve the proposed changes to the Disciplinary Overlap Process section of the Curriculum Writer's Handbook?

President Persons opened by thanking Ann Foster for editing the document to include previous

suggestions made by the AS; and clarified that at the end of the document where it refers to Bylaws Article 3, Section 1, this is to make it clear where the appeals process is in the Bylaws.

The clarifying question “What would a full appeals process look like once it reaches the AS?” was asked; and it was clarified that once a faculty member requests an appeal process to the AS, it would be listed as an agenda item for discussion by the AS, during which a Senator could motion to adjudicate the decision.

Senators asked if it would be listed as an action item immediately; President Persons clarified that it would be expected to come first as a discussion item, and A. Foster also clarified that the CRC would provide minutes that reflect where the matter was initially discussed to the AS.

Another question was asked if there was any meaning to the double-asterisks (\*\*) on the document, A. Foster clarified that it was in relation to a department chair process.

M. Ohkubo moved to approve the CRC Overlap Process as presented to the Senate Body, which was seconded.

A senator favored the motion, stating that they feel the CRC will do a good job of handling issues; and another commented that the AS should be prepared in the event that a final decision would need to be made and should be brought up in future discussion, no matter how rare the occurrence may be.

A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 25 unanimous yes votes.

3. Accreditation Workgroup Composition. Scope, Purpose, and Selection – Shall the 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 the selection of faculty members to participate, and who shall make the selections to the work group?

President Persons opened the topic by thanking Senator Avasthi for her time in compiling a summarized document that the ASEC then used to draft the Accreditation Workgroup Supporting Document (a.w.s.d.) included in the meeting materials; stated there was care taken that ASEC did not want to get ahead of the body and felt that the a.w.s.d. would help provide a summary-to-date of the ongoing discussion, and emphasized that it is the prerogative of the Senate body to accept, reject, or modify any and all parts of the a.w.s.d.

Senators shared gratitude towards ASEC for generating language, and suggested that there is flexibility to allow the Workgroup to not be tied to the exact wording of the a.w.s.d.

Senators suggested removing from item 3 of the Goals the portion of the sentence starting with “which may include consequences for faculty/departments that do not engage in said process”, as it is covered by AFA related contract language and purview; stated that in item 4 of the goals, per the faculty contract, a link to the COR is sufficient; pointed out that according to the ACCJC, a link to the COR was not sufficient and that SRJC needed to ensure that COR syllabi to include statements of learning outcomes, which is in contrast to current contract provisions, and felt that Item 4 needed to stay in.

President Persons passed the gavel to VP Ohkubo to reaffirm what the previous senator stated in regard to the changes to item 3 and 4; stated that the Senate should confer with the VPAA with what consequences might be if faculty do not assess their SLOs appropriately, but is in complete agreement to remove any language in regards to consequences of faculty or departments.

A Senator stated while there are a lot of good ideas in the document, asked whether this is an actual summary of what was discussed within the AS because they felt it did not reflect what was actually discussed per the approved minutes; per the last meeting, the VPAA stated that the PRPP already has a schedule to assess SLOs which department chairs already oversee,

recommended that this workgroup should be looking at the data presented and speak to those department chairs to see what worked, then report back to the AS.

Senators commented that ACCJC told us to stop the current process of assessing SLOs and to revise what we are currently doing because it was not sufficient; expressed deep disappointment that there is no mention of SLO-related trainings for faculty members or departments; asked when this issue is going to get addressed; noted that the disaggregation of the data would fall to The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and not faculty or chairs.

President Persons redirected the AS to be thinking of suggestions, and that if the AS wanted to use the a.w.s.d. as a basis for a shared understanding of what the workgroup should be thinking then to phrase these concerns as suggested edits and changes to the a.w.s.d.; and reminded those present the goal was to have the workgroup identify what groups and data would be disaggregated as per the VPAA's previous ask of the AS.

Senators suggested changes to items three and four; recommended switching from the word "reporting" to "assessing" in item 3, and that we should be assessing what we are currently doing instead of creating a whole new process; suggested item 3 should read as "Revising the regular SLOs reported process, which may include recommending consequences..."; suggested item 4 to read "Clarify whether SLOs need to be on the syllabus or linked from a COR"; and recommended adding "any matters of contract or workload will be referred to AFA for negotiations as appropriate" overall to the included items.

A clarifying question was asked whether the work must be finished before the VPAA included deadline; VPAA R. Holcomb clarified that ideally this workgroup start the work in Fall 2022 and begin implementation in Spring 2023.

M. Anderman motioned that the Accreditation Workgroup will have 5 charges and the proposed fifth charge is to "5. Gather data from Departments regarding methods of SLO assessment and move toward college-wide standards for SLO assessments where data can be easily disaggregated", which was seconded.

E. Schmidt moved to extend time by 4 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senators commented that there are items within the document pertaining to contracts; reported that CCSF sued ACCJC for consequences regarding SLOs and won, stating that there can be no tie between SLOs and any component faculty evaluation; and another senator stated that ACCJC had an obvious issue with our current process regarding SLOs.

Comments were made that the Academic Senate needs to push this through, as it is a huge process that will take time; that SRJC is under the wire as far as holding up the district's accreditation; and felt the document is sufficient with the edits proposed.

A. Oliver moved to extend time by 4 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Suggestions were made regarding meeting times; that 3-4 meetings in the fall semester for 1 hour each would not be enough time to get this done; a clarification was made that per the document, it states 3-4 meetings per month, likely 1 meeting per week; and another suggestion was made to remove item 4 from the goals, due to relevant negotiated items.

A point of order was made that the AS was out of time for discussion. J. Stover moved to extend time to the end of the meeting and by 9 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

*[concluded next page]*

A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 19 yes votes, 2 no votes and 4 abstentions as follows:

M. Anderman – yes	A. Donegan – yes	G. Morre – abstain
L. Aspinall – yes	W. Downey – abstain	M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Atilgan Reylea – yes	J. Fassler – no	A. Oliver – yes
S. Avasthi – no	G. Garcia – yes	P. Ozbirinci – yes
V. Bertsch – abstain	T. Jacobson – yes	E. Schmidt – yes
J. Bush – yes	T. Johnson – yes	H. Skoonberg – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	L. Larsen (proxy D. Lemmer) – yes	N. Slovak – yes
S. Cavales Doolan – abstain	D. Lemmer – yes	J. Stover – yes
		P. Usina – yes

J. Stover moved to eliminate the language beginning with goals item 3 “(3) ...which may include consequences for faculty/departments that do not engage in said process” thru item 4 “(4) Establish that SLOs need to be on syllabi, not merely linked to the COR”, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 24 yes votes and 1 abstention as follows:

M. Anderman – yes	A. Donegan – yes	G. Morre – yes
L. Aspinall – yes	W. Downey – yes	M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Atilgan Reylea – abstain	J. Fassler – yes	A. Oliver – yes
S. Avasthi – yes	G. Garcia – yes	P. Ozbirinci – yes
V. Bertsch – yes	T. Jacobson – yes	E. Schmidt – yes
J. Bush – yes	T. Johnson – yes	H. Skoonberg – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes	L. Larsen (proxy D. Lemmer) – yes	N. Slovak – yes
S. Cavales Doolan – yes	D. Lemmer – yes	J. Stover – yes
		P. Usina – yes

L. Aspinall moved to extend time by 3 minutes to 5:03 pm, which was seconded and not opposed.

L. Aspinall moved to accept the description of the Accreditation Workgroup Supporting Document as perfected by the Body, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 25 unanimous yes votes.

## **DISCUSSION**

None.

## **INFORMATION**

None.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

5:04 p.m.