



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 3, 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. Flyswithawks, N. Frantz, C. Hillman, T. Jacobson, J. Kosten, D. Lemmer, S. Martin, L. Nahas, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, R. Romagnoli, S. Rosen, J. Stover, J. Thompson, K. Valenzuela, K. Wegman, S. Whyly, S. Winston

### ABSENT

G. Sellu (proxy R. Romagnoli)

### GUESTS

L. Larqué

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President J. Thompson. Vice President M. Ohkubo read the Land Acknowledgement statement.

### OPEN FORUM

1. E. Schmidt expressed concern regarding course accessibility as per a student request for closed-captioning in lectures despite lack of official Disability Resources Department (DRD) accommodation: although auto-captioning would meet ADA compliance, auto-captioning features are weak / "garbage"; students should not have to "out" themselves for basic accommodations; faculty are untrained and unpaid for the time to caption their own videos; severe constraints with staffing and funding in DRD and Distance Education need to be resolved; requested Senate take up the matter and/or forward to All Faculty Association [AFA] for negotiation as soon as possible.
2. E. Wilde shared concerns about Online Proctoring Software stating that: technology is not neutral and has ethical implications; disputed claims that proctoring software "works" and "is necessary"; argued online proctoring software is not an effective deterrent to cheating, it is not ethical, and the software posed a security risks to students and their privacy; shared concerns that Proctorio is a "prison-to-school" technology; reported on success of Honor Codes decreasing cheating at other institutions by one-quarter to one-half (Center for Academic Integrity based at Duke University); noted Proctorio's engagement in unethical business practices. [See E. Wilde's Presentation here.](#)
3. A. Donegan shared Class Size Taskforce activities: collected arguments from 15+ departments on pedagogically-based class sizes limits; forwarded recommendations to AFA for negotiation; recognized Curriculum Committee's hard work in reviewing the Emergency Distance Education Addenda; thanked the Curriculum Committee, AFA, and District in their follow up; urged the Senate to remain engaged in and communicative with accreditation groups in ongoing assessment of SLOs; noted less than 50% of SLOs assessed to date; hoped for report finalization by end of Sp21.
4. R. Romagnoli brought forward the confidential concern of an English Department colleague, who stated that Proctorio offers instructors many highly customizable options for remote monitoring of exams and essays; noted that without such technologies instructors are left with the expectation that students, on their honor, would never use outside resources when prohibited; noted an essential need for test proctoring in remote environments; expressed hope that SRJC will renew its subscription to a program supporting preservation of academic integrity in online instruction.

5. Laura Aspinall promoted upcoming co-sponsored event by DRD and Intercultural Centers: Tuesday, February 9, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Leroy Moore is an author, poet, filmmaker, performer, activist and founder of Krip-Hop Nation; he will be presenting “Black Disability in Resistance and Creating: Story Telling and Moore,” as focused on Black disabled resistance through time, ancestry stories, and contemporary Krip-Hop stories and cultural work worldwide including literature, songs, visual arts, videos and podcast. [More information about this event is included here.](#)

## MINUTES

K. Valenzuela proposed a correction to the January 20 minutes regarding her Open Forum comments, which was made.

J. Carlin-Goldberg motioned to approve the January 20 minutes with the amendment; K. Valenzuela seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the January 20 minutes were adopted as amended with 22 in favor and 4 abstaining.

## ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

## REPORTS

1. President’s Report – Introduced A. Quinn as incoming Administrative Assistant when A. Hopkins is on leave; welcomed C. Hillman, contract faculty, Department of Kinesiology, Athletics, and Dance, appointed to fill vacancy in Area 10 seat (through May 2021).

Reminder of two upcoming trainings: February 19th, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m., Stephanie Curry, Statewide Academic Senate (ASCCC) on parliamentary procedures; March 19<sup>th</sup>, 12:00 to 3:00 p.m., Laura Schulkind, District Legal Counsel, training on diversity in hiring; stated that both trainings are important, with hiring and diversity training of special value to ongoing Senate discussions on Board Policy 4.3.2/P.

J. Thompson acknowledged the difficulty of preparing for electronic elections remotely.

Listed on the [Senator Resources 2020 – 2021 webpage](#) is a new section entitled “Professional Development Resources on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion” and devoted to relevant, non-exhaustive, resources. J. Thompson invited the Senate to send additional helpful resources that would be posted and shared.

J. Thompson shared the results from the Guided Pathways Recommendation Ranking; results are posted to the [Senate’s Guided Pathways webpage](#). [Read J. Thompson’s full report here.](#)

2. *Lanzamiento* Report – L. Larqué reported that the first Title V HSI Quarterly Grant Progress Update (GPU) was submitted to US Department of Education Program Officer in January; GPU was shared with the Senate and is available on the [Senator Resources 2020 – 2021 webpage](#) and [also here](#); the Title V HSI Steering Committee and the HSI Implementation Team held their first meetings in January; there would be an email “open call” to faculty soliciting interest in teaching HSI-designated *Lanzamiento* sections in Fall 2021; there is an estimated 25 – 30 *Lanzamiento* sections expected in Grant Year One (Fall 2021, Spring 2022, Summer 2022); a dedicated webpage is under development; any relevant questions may be sent to Dr. R. Holcomb and/or L. Larqué. [Read L. Larqué’s full report here.](#)

## ACTION

None

## ELECTIONS of Executive Committee members.

1. L. Nahas, of the Elections Committee, notified the Senate that a single candidate had put their name forward for two positions and explained the steps of the Election Committee in light of the

dual candidacy: the Senate voted that the Executive Committee will have eight members; no one candidate can hold two seats; no rule was established in advance requiring candidates run in one race only; if/when a candidate runs for more than one seat and as a candidate cannot be elected to both, the candidate will state a preference to The Elections Committee prior to the election; the Elections Committee will record candidate's preference and apply accordingly (if needed) during certification processes. The Election was called, voting occurred, The Elections Committee certified the results in a separate breakout, and the Executive Committee verified. All returned to the main Senate chambers, and A. Hopkins, administrative assistant, announced the election results:

- Officer of Equity: Lauren Servais
- At-Large Position: Laura Aspinall
- Adjunct Position: Jessica Bush

## CONSENT

1. Student Educational Rights and Privacy, Board Policy 8.2.9/P. *Shall there be a subgroup of Senators who will review the proposed revisions to Board Policy and Procedure 8.2.9/P and share their recommendations with the Academic Senate in a timely fashion?*

After the President briefly shared relevant background information, a roll call vote was taken; the motion carried unanimously with 26 in favor.

## DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Professional Development: Equity, Diversity, Inclusivity, & Anti-Racism

J. Thompson began a follow-up discussion on the Senate's decision to recommend a requirement for faculty to have professional development in equity, diversity, inclusivity, and anti-racism.

R. Romagnoli moved that the Senate create a task force of DEI experts to conduct research and draft a resolution that grounds the Senate's professional development recommendations in our commitments to anti-racism, to BSU's (Black Student Union's) demands, and to becoming an anti-racist campus. The task force should present a draft at our February 17th meeting. Seconded by T. Jacobson.

A Senator raised a point of order that a motion must first be made to move the Discussion Item to Action; and welcomed the materials shared on the Senator Resources page; and hoped that faculty would benefit from the practice, allowing faculty to update curriculum or syllabi, but advised that one-size does not fit all for the numerous disciplines campus; and to keep that in mind when offering the possibility to fulfill the requirement. Additional discussion included: a question about the motion and a request for more information about what the purpose and functionality of having a resolution is, and then asked if a resolution can or cannot be made now.

It was clarified that if a senator wants to make a motion, it be moved to an Action item first, or let the item come back and take action at the next meeting; and that, with regard to the resolution, the Senate to consider a sub-committee, rather than a task force, if wanting just those within the Senate to address this issue; and then, whatever that committee comes up with, the Senate could focus on what resolution would be brought to the Board or District.

President Thompson noted: by marking a Discussion item "urgent" only then could it be moved to an Action item by a two-thirds vote; otherwise, to take any immediate action a two-thirds vote to suspend the Bylaws would be necessary; the time necessary to have a full discussion in future meetings was assured.

Senators asked for clarifications on what constitutes DEI expertise; suggested that a subgroup of Senators investigate/bring back recommendations to the Senate body; suggested including non-Senators in a smaller group; requested addressing equity of online learning/how the shift to online

learning harms neediest students; discussed challenges of size of Senate and size of a potential workgroup; expressed concerns that a smaller subgroup would not best represent all colleagues; expressed hopes of respecting faculty agency in any required, future training related to DEI.

Further points included that the suggestion that the Senate Executive Equity Officer head up a DEI taskforce and a reminder that last fall the Senate would make a point of marking every DEI Discussion topic as urgent.

Senators' further noted that creating a task-force makes sense, but cautioned about what task-force brings back is not taken at face value; made a request to rank any forthcoming recommendation from a task force; stated that DEI expertise qualifications include academic background, lived experience, and demonstrated history of anti-racist engagement across campus; stated that both DEI work and relevant degrees in a DEI fields may be recognized; reminded that Senate that DEI training is a safety issue for colleagues, a point raised in Summer 2020, and goes beyond pedagogical concerns; discipline expertise differs from DEI expertise; suggested a menu of options and opportunity for individuals to suggest training topics in any forthcoming DEI efforts.

J. Stover made the motion to move this topic to an Action item in support of continued discussion and the possibility for taking action at the next meeting. J. Carlin-Goldberg seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken; the motion carried unanimously with 26 in favor.

The President noted that the first motion [offered by R. Romagnoli and seconded by T. Jacobson] had not been resolved and could be addressed in the February 17<sup>th</sup> Action Item Discussion.

With time expired, the discussion closed.

## **INFORMATION**

### **1. Technology and Student Privacy**

J. Thompson acknowledged the importance of the issue of technology and student privacy, and wanted the Senate and faculty to know that their concerns had been heard. Student and faculty privacy are two different things, where faculty privacy is the purview of the AFA and District rather than the Senate. The floor was open for comments only.

Senators' comments and concerns included: privacy concerns around equity issues with students; feedback from constituents in Life Science Department for support of college-wide discussion on Proctorio, that Life Sciences faculty members are "respectfully and responsibly" using the program, and they are concerned about disruption and workload issues if it is further problematized; accessibility issues relating to light emission for blind/low-vision students; concerns including atypical facial expression or movements, which could be perceived as a trigger; the point that Proctorio is not the only program the District owns that is not fully accessible; concerns about the umbrella concept of monitoring as also includes Turn It In and other tools of that nature the District is already employing; appreciation of the honor code philosophy as used by faculty; the statement that proctoring exams is important especially for exam integrity and ensuring students earn grades honestly; concerns over ESL students and potential issues with ID and camera equipment with respect to students' immigration status; need for some form of proxy deemed necessary and requiring further research and thought; consultation with students sought as part of the process; which state or outside accreditation standards also require proctoring to be taken into account; the statement that Senate oversight remains central to these, and other, processes.

### **2. Introduction to Board Policy / Procedure 4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring: Regular and Adjunct (Ed. Code 87360)**

J. Thompson heard Senators ask for more information around hiring policy and recommended attending the upcoming training with Laura Schulkind to help inform further discussion; feedback

received from Stephanie Curry at ASCCC re: SRJC's Senate as potentially moving too quickly to motions and debate prior to adequate discussion time dedicated a priori.

A Senator shared: the scheduled training would be key in addressing the issue from substantive, legal, and ethical standpoints; any Senate action should follow after said training; any edits or changes to Current Board Policy 4.3.2/P should be democratized by including a subgroup or Senate as a whole in editing/changes proposed; that changes proposed in original discussion undermined equity; that there was no stopgap measure at the end of the hiring process for alignment between College President's final decision with recommendations forwarded.

J. Thompson asked that Senators refer to the Senator Resources webpage to help inform their discussions, as there are pertinent resources listed there, and urged Senators to share articles or resources they recommend with her so these can be posted to the Senator Resources page.

Additional concerns raised: How can Senate consult with Human Resources, allowing enough Senate conversation, while at the same time, being expeditious, taking into account that other processes/steps follow after Senate's review. Senators also voiced concerns that the Senate had previously discussed/voted on this item, but their decision was not brought forward to the Board of Trustees.

President Thompson agreed that the process of revising hiring policy had been a long and arduous one, brought first to the Senate in 2017, and would be a priority going forward on Senate agendas. The upcoming Senate training – for Senators and faculty on hiring committees – will also be an important resource for continued discussions and changing current hiring policies and procedures for the better.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

5:00 p.m.