



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 2, 2022

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Zoom only

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

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

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. Flyswithawks, M. Hale, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, J. Kosten, J. Kmetko, D. Lemmer, A. Oliver, N. Persons, B. Reaves, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, N. Slovak, J. Stover, J. Thompson, K. Valenzuela, S. Whylly, S. Winston

ABSENT L. Aspinall (T. Johnson)

GUESTS Michael Von der Porten, Norma Ortiz, SGA President Delashay Carmona Benson, Jimmy Brock, Matti Cottrell, Leticia Contreras

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. Carlin Goldberg.

OPEN FORUM

1. M. Von der Porten, community member, announced that there are four weeks until the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) conducts its onsite review of the accreditation process at SRJC; stated most of the general community have no idea what is happening; pointed out that the Internal Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) states there was a press release inviting the community to participate in the accreditation visit and cannot be located; requested a readable summary of the 270-page ISER, which he felt was incomprehensible and had already closed to public comments last week; stated there are no meetings which alumni, donors, members of our city councils, board of supervisors, or the general public may participate in the onsite review; posited that SRJC believes it has all the answers; reiterated SRJC should seek community input and not build walls.

[Read M. Von der Porten's full statement here](#)

2. N. Ortiz, SRJC Student, commented on the verbiage in the [4.3.2P Section III Screening & Interviewing Committee Support](#) document (not minutes); stated wherein item one of the document reads "...should include members who are knowledgeable about the District's commitment to attract and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty" – that students should be counted in that vote; highlighted item two from page one, "must receive appropriate orientation training in District's hiring practices within the previous year" and item six from page two, "shall all SIC members be required to participate in each phase of process in its entirety?"; questioned whether this negatively impacts policies related to release of information from HR despite confidential practices; wishes the senate to review policies related to SIC members searching for positions on both campuses in case of possible conflict of interest that may arise; asked the Academic Senate (AS), "How will this structure comply with policy rules, regulations, and applicable laws?" and "What are the specifics of the academic affair rep in this role?", and; concluded that the voting process needs to have at least two students for equity and fairness purposes and should include student alternates.
3. D. Carmona-Benson, Student Government (SGA) President, commented on the ongoing discussion concerning the inclusion of students in the faculty hiring process, stated that anything less than a vote would be an insult; hoped for consideration of more than an advisory vote; reiterated SGA 9+1 purview; stated that AS should provide opportunities not barriers, and; conceded the rest of her time for fellow SGA officers.

4. J. Brock, SGA, voiced that students should have a right to vote on who is in the classroom, and; stated that education is among the most important things in life.
5. M. Cottrell, SGA, voiced support for student votes on hiring committees; stressed the importance of serious consideration; reiterated SGA’s resolution and it’s forwarding to AS; reminded the AS of participating in a structure that was not built for the majority, but rather for “white land-owning men”; commented on the current meeting’s Zoom Gallery and noted the diversity and voices of all present, and; concluded that it is up to us to strive to broaden democracy—to let everyone in—in and out of the academia world.
6. L. Contreras, Associate (formerly Adjunct/Part-Time) Faculty Member, expressed support for student advocacy towards their inclusion in faculty hiring committees; asked what constitutes meaningful engagement; discouraged “no impact” inclusion; stressed the importance of consequence or impact when creating meaningful engagement; voiced that students want active participation in their education and SRJC mission as a “teaching college,” and; concluded by stating that students should have a democratic ability to participate in this process.
7. D. Carmona Benson spoke on behalf of the Black Student Union (BSU) in regard to allowing students a vote in the hiring process; reminded the AS of related BSU demands, and; expressed the importance of diverse perspectives.

MINUTES

M. Anderman moved to approve the January 19 minutes; F. Avila seconded the motion. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes with 22 yes votes and 1 abstention as follows:

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

REPORTS

1. President’s Report – J. Thompson

J. Thompson welcomed N. Haworth as the Academic Senate’s (AS) new administrative assistant; acknowledged the heavy workload of the job and sent appreciation for jumping in so quickly; welcomed two new senators filling temporary vacancies in Area Three – Michael Hale (Spring 2022) – and in Area Ten – Nikki Slovak (leave replacement until April); announced a forthcoming New Senator Orientation (time to be announced); reiterated the nomination period for 2022-2024 AS Seats is open until Feb 23; invited all to the AS Spring Retreat, Feb 11, 10am to 3pm, the last 90 minutes of which will be ASCCC presentation on Ethnic Studies, Minimum Qualifications in Equivalency, hosted by Cheryl Aschenbach and LaTonya Parker; announced the Strategic Planning Town Halls on the 2nd/4th Fridays going forward and that it conflicts with Senate Retreat (among other events), so surveys will be used to gather ideas for those who cannot attend in order to maximize opportunities for participation, and; recognized the important, ongoing facilitation and coordination work of the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee (SPCC) between the Town Hall meetings.

Announced the forthcoming, formal retirement announcement of L. Jane Saldana-Talley, Vice

President of Academic Affairs (VPAA); announced that AS Executive Committee (ASEC) Members, DCC co-chairs Alice Hampton and Luz Navarrete, and AFA President Shawn Martin will be coordinating efforts in support of a forum where faculty input can be shared on what to look for in the next VPAA; noted the experience, background, and values of the next VPAA in relation to the AS, AFA, DCC, and faculty was as a matter of great concern; stressed the importance of contributing to the visioning of the next VPAA with more information to come.

J, Thompson also mentioned that College Council (CC) held a retreat (January 31st) to work on the redesign of the participatory governance structure; pointed out that the CC is moving through action steps in the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Plan (IEPIP) that was developed last spring; identified action steps for both participatory governance systems and strategic enrollment; mentioned that SRJC has more committees and councils than most other community colleges; noted the difficulty in filling all of the available committee member seats and the overdue nature of this work, and; stressed the importance of protecting faculty and AS rights and responsibilities regarding academic and professional matters; mentioned the Educational Planning and Coordinating Committee (EPCC) recently completed work on two policies, accreditation and student athletes, which will appear on future agendas in the AS, and; concluded with a statement echoed from a previous conversation at a DCC meeting: that many of our students are struggling in current, challenging conditions with online courses, positive COVID tests, missed classes, and the need for in person services currently delayed due to safety concerns – and made an appeal to have “grace for students.”

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

CONSENT

None.

ACTION

1. Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Processes

J. Thompson started the conversation, noting the Item had been moved from Discussion to Action at the last meeting, and that there was no current motion on the table. A senator proposed a straw poll be taken to see where the AS stood on student participation in the faculty hiring process, while another senator pointed out that three previous straw polls taken at the last meeting had already defined the informal will of the AS and posted the results of those straw polls in the chat. J. Thompson pointed out the specific aspect of the agenda item, reading the action item’s question “What shall be the Senate’s recommendation(s) regarding student participation in the faculty hiring process?”.

Some senators expressed confusion in that they thought the ASEC would draft a menu of options from which student participation in the hiring process could be chosen; expressed being uncomfortable with a straw poll without more context or specificity; stated that on faculty hiring committees you do not vote on candidates, you rank, score and discuss, come to a consensus, and then forward final candidates to administrators, and; voiced support for student participation, but wanted to see a document drafted with options for student participation before moving forward with a motion or vote.

J. Thompson stated that developing options for student participation on hiring committees before a motion was made was not advisable, that motions grow out of discussions, and encouraged senators to think back this on previous discussions on this topic and move towards a motion, further noting that a motion could include a list of participatory options.

Senators shared frustration with the ongoing conversations on the topic, feeling some are getting caught up in the semantics of the word “vote” and are pretending they do not understand what it means for a student to have a “vote”; reiterated that when someone says that students

should get a vote, they are saying that students should have a voice and be able to contribute on faculty hiring committees; restated that students want to participate in the hiring of their full-time instructors in a way that is meaningful to and carries weight within those conversations.

J. Thompson asked senators to move towards a motion; noted the extensive work already done; recognized it is okay that senators are not all in agreement, that this is a democratic process, and a motion will emerge from the topic, and we will vote.

A first point of order was called to remind senators that the current topic was a Discussion Item and the next step would be to move it to an Action Item. A second point of order was called immediately following, correcting the first point of order, stating that the current topic was an Action Item and the next step would be a motion.

President-Elect N. Persons contextualized that “voting” for students in the faculty hiring process could mean whether or not the student representative on the hiring committee would have their points for each area of criteria counted in the total number of points; agreed that there is not a “vote” on a hiring committee but indicated the student voice on an individual candidate would be provided through the point system; shared support for students being full members on faculty hiring committees, and; noted that SRJC prides ourselves on being a teaching institution and posited what is more helpful in finding our next teacher than the perspective of a student?

Another senator stressed there are departments that have already diversified their faculty by implementing the existing hiring policy; shared statistics on new BIPOC hires in the Math Department (64% since 2013-2014) and resultant increases in faculty diversity amongst faculty (from 20% to 43%); noted that these new instructors uphold SRJC’s high standards of excellence and promote student learning; noted their successful diversification of the Math Department with hiring committees have been made up by discipline experts without students or faculty from outside the discipline, and; made the statement, “The Math Department wishes the hiring policy to remain the same. We are opposed to the Senate dictating our every move when it comes to hiring. We are not in favor of students being required to be part of the hiring process. The Math Department has unanimously voted against requiring students and faculty members outside the discipline from serving on our hiring committees.”

President Thompson noted the conversation had, unofficially, moved from action to discussion, and reminded senators again to review the action item topic and remember what discussions had already occurred on the topic.

Further discussions followed which expressed conflicting opinions on how much students should participate in the hiring process and whether it should be a requirement; reflections that this process should be left to the departments to make their own decisions based on a menu of options provided by the Senate; stated that there are a lot of ways for the student voice can be heard, and; relayed concerns from Associate Faculty members about students having access to transcripts and letters of interests from colleagues who already work here.

J. Stover motioned to extend the time by 5 minutes. F. Avila seconded that motion. There were no objections.

A Point of Order was called to announce that the Zoom Chat feature was reopened after having been closed temporarily, and; a reminder was provided that the Zoom Chat feature is for motions and language related to motions only, and not to be used for issue-based advocacy.

T. Jacobson made a motion and moved that “Departments and hiring committees should include a form of student participation in the hiring process.” T. Johnson seconded the motion.

Senators spoke both in favor and against the motion, noting the importance of student participation as it relates to diversity; wanting stronger language requiring, not just recommending, student participation, and; asking for better definition of student participation.

J. Thompson reminded senators that if the motion passes, there can be subsequent motions on the same agenda item, and that an initial motion could be followed by other motions addressing other items senators have stated that they want.

T. Jacobson proposed amending her motion, changing the verbiage to “shall” in place of “should,” thus possibly reading “Departments and hiring committees ~~should~~ shall include a form of student participation in the hiring process.”

J. Fassler motion to extend time by another 5 minutes, M. Anderman seconded that motion. There were no objections.

A series of points of order and clarifications were made regarding motions, amendments to motions, voting on motions, clarifications that the type of student participation in faculty hiring was not defined, and that defining or clarifying student participation would happen later.

S. Whylly called the question on the motion, moving the body to vote.

Clarification was made that this vote is to include student participation on faculty hiring committees and does not specify the nature of the participation, which will need to be determined later.

A point of order was called; the amended motion does not state that clarifying participation will be determined later.

Clarification was provided that the motion had been called, there is no further discussion, and that a motion needs to be made to move to amend first, followed by the votes on the amended (or not) motion(s).

T. Jacobson moved to amend the original motion to change the verbiage from “should” to “shall”, reading “Departments and hiring committees ~~should~~ shall include a form of student participation in the hiring process.” J. Stover seconded the amended motion.

A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the amended motion with 16 Yes, 7 No, with 3 abstentions as follows:

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

J. Thompson restated the perfected motion: “Departments and hiring committees shall include a form of student participation in the hiring process” and asked for Secretary Stover to take the vote, the question having previously been called on the topic.

[continued on next page]

A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the motion with 15 Yes, 9 No, with 2 abstentions as follows:

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

J. Thompson advised that if the Senate wanted to take the language that was just approved and work to further define the scope, the body could do so going forward, and a majority of senators indicated via straw poll (16) they wished for this specific question to come back.

DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Hiring Procedure (Ed. Code 87360)

a. Composition of Screening and Interviewing Committee

J. Thompson announced that she will be taking a series of straw-polls for each sub-question under the parent topic on the discussion agenda, which was pulled from the [existing draft](#); reviewed that the Senate is reviewing the composition of the [4.3.2P Section III Screening & Interviewing Committee Support Document](#); the question being : “what shall be the Senate’s recommendation(s) regarding composition of screening and interviewing committees?”

A point of order was called asking senators to take down their previous, Zoom-based “yes” markers (yes markers).

Beginning with the straw-polling, J. Thompson read that item 1 states “...should include members who are knowledgeable about the District’s commitment to attract and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty able to meet the needs of the District's diverse student population.”

A straw poll of approximately 18 yes markers for this item indicated senator support for this language.

J. Thompson then read item 2, stating “must receive appropriate orientation training in District hiring practices within the previous year.” A straw poll of approximately 22 yes markers for this item indicated senator support for this language.

J. Thompson read that Items 2.A-D state:

- a. “review of this policy and procedure”
- b. “review of the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan”
- c. “review of data identifying the diversity of the District's students and faculty, including their socio-economic status, disabilities, gender distribution, and ethnic backgrounds”
- d. “sign a statement in which they (1) confirm their completion of these reviews and their understanding of the confidential nature of all steps in the hiring process and (2) agree to maintain full confidentiality”

A straw poll of approximately 23 yes markers for items 2.A., 2.B., 2.C. and 2.D. indicated senator support for this language.

J. Thompson indicated she wanted senators who did not indicate support for the language to make any points regarding the document's language.

Senators voiced that the language "should" should be change to "shall" (which means that we're requiring) or "may" (which means that we are allowing); J. Thompson replied that the " should" comes from the [4.3.2P Mark-Up Draft \(May 6, 2020\)](#); that the current body can recommend the language be stronger; asked whether once a person has this training, does that then help create a committee in which they are knowledgeable.

Moving on, page two of the [4.3.2P Section III Screening & Interviewing Committee Support Document](#) reads heavily into the composition of the existing draft and discussions the AS has had over the last 12 months, with the first point related to the composition of SIC for regular faculty, with the draft under review stating "no fewer than six."

A senator pointed out that the language regarding "no fewer than 6" was different than existing policy, which states 5; asked why the AS made the decision to change it from 5 to 6, and another senator recollected it was due to expansion for regular faculty added to the committee.

Additional comments noted at least 12 differences were found when comparing the existing Board policy and the 2018 AS draft currently under review, offered to share the summarized compare/contrast document with senators; expressed respect for previous Senate work, and; wanted to make sure the AS understands the current draft differs from the existing policy.

J. Thompson reflected that the current document is representative of years' worth of work from previous AS deliberations; noted that the document also does not mean that the current body cannot make decisions, and; now that it has been taken it up again, it can be changed.

A straw poll of approximately 23 yes markers for items 2.A., 2.B., 2.C. and 2.D. indicated senator support for this language.

A straw poll of approximately 16 no markers and 2 yes markers on the language "no fewer than six" members on a hiring committee indicated senators' lack of support for the language.

A senator suggested that the drafting should start with who exactly needs to sit on the hiring committees first and before coming back to finalize a specific number.

A straw poll was called on whether we should come back to the question of the specific number of participants later and support from senators was expressed with 17 yes markers and 4 no markers.

J. Thompson devised that the point of return for the next Senate Meeting start with question 2 on page 2 of the [4.3.2P Section III Screening & Interviewing Committee Support Document](#); addressed the next discussion item; noted follow up with Board President Battenfeld on whether we would take progress to date on the procedure and forward to VP/HR for review; and stated the Senate is being encouraged by Senior Administrators and the Board of Trustees to move this work forward.

A final comment from a senator suggested removing the phrase "so that revisions may be implemented this spring" given the ongoing AS conversations are still in progress in spring.

INFORMATION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

5:02 p.m.