



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 16, 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. Whyly

ABSENT S. Winston (L. Aspinall)

GUESTS E. Dale, J. Paisley, and R. Findling

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 Senator H. Skoonberg.

OPEN FORUM

1. D. Carmona-Benson, Student Government Assembly (SGA) President, asked that the Academic Senate (AS) read the resolutions that were sent as well as the information being passed from the Chancellor's Office; reported that students being placed on hiring committees in California is flourishing; asked why SRJC isn't a leader in this movement; asked that a student be added to the Vice President of Academic Affairs hiring committee; acknowledged it is complicated and that students' 9+1 rights be respected.
2. V. Bertsch requested AS input regarding the revised SRJC scholarship process which no longer includes student names when forwarded to departments; explained that scholarships not only play an important role in helping ease the financial strain of students, but also a deeper role in developing the link between students, faculty, and discipline; noted the lack of deeper context in the revised process as leaning towards a faceless bureaucracy that only benefits students with high GPAs and strong writing skills; and asked for a revised process.
[See V. Bertsch's Full Statement](#)
3. D. Carmona Benson spoke for BSU/Black History Month; promoted 2/28 event, 3:00-4:30 pm, mentioned that members from Black Organizations in Sonoma County have been invited, and asked for support.
4. J. Kmetko noted their program would also like to see students' names on the scholarship applications; reported that the process worked against students, equity, and inclusion; and noted that a holistic approach would avoid bias.
5. Norma Ortiz, SRJC Student, asked questions regarding the short- and long-term participation, engagement, and inclusion components of student participation on faculty hiring committees, including but not limited to what training will be provided and how many students will be able to participate; expressed appreciation that most faculty were in favor of students' participation but wanted to know why others were opposed; and expressed appreciation for the Senate's work.
6. J. Carlin-Goldberg, Chair of the Math Department Scholarship Committee, noted that transcripts to help assess who is awarded scholarships will no longer be provided to them; pointed to the importance of transcript assessment as an essential part of the process; and wanted to know who is making these decisions and why they are excluding the identity and transcripts needed

for screening scholarship applications.

7. K. Valenzuela echoed the perspectives of the other senators regarding the scholarship processes and opined that whoever is making these decisions is overreaching.

MINUTES

Senator J. Kmetko requested that the URL for “M. Von der Porten full statement” be corrected.

Senator H. Skoonberg moved to approve as amended the February 2 minutes; Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes as amended with 24 yes votes, 1 absence, and 1 abstention.

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

REPORTS

1. President’s Report — J. Thompson

President Thompson thanked Senator F. Avila for her Spring 2022 Elections Committee service; noted the AS will be sending a call for faculty members to express interest in serving on the VPAA’s search committee (2 seats) with statements due February 22 at 9am.

President Thompson reported that College Council continues its redesign work of the SRJC committee system and is working with a set of drafted principles that include support for the College’s mission; advocacy for principles of diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism; respect for purview; eliminating redundancy; identifying clear roles vis-a-vis the college; clearly describing work products that each committee and council will be responsible for; and valuing expertise and informed decision making; reported that the Council continues its work to transition to the Community College League of California’s templates; and noted that the Council will create a mechanism to ensure that constituency groups have a voice in contributing to policy and procedure review.

President Thompson also reported that SRJC is considering proposals from companies that provide Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Student Information System (SIS) products; announced that a series of demonstrations on different aspects of the software functions will be demoed during the weeks of March 28 and April 11; noted that scheduling notifications will be sent out and that feedback on the products is desired. Additional information included mention of the first Strategic Town Hall Meeting on Friday, February 11; appreciation for Dr. Jeremy Smotherman for his continued partnership and committee members for their contributions; a reminder that the next town hall meeting will be held on Friday, February 25, 9am – 12pm, and will focus on the College’s Mission, Vision, and Values; the Chancellor’s office announcement that the Guided Pathways (GP) budget may be spent down after June 30 as long as a plan is provided for that spending; information about the Faculty Equivalency Committee’s work to establish practices that will help with workload, including increasing the size of the committee to and splitting the committee into two groups that will work simultaneously; creation of support documents to help applicant prepare strong applications; and an invitation to Senators to

request updates on information not already provided.

[See President J. Thompson's Full Report](#)

2. Guided Pathways Academic Supports Workgroup (5) – E. Dale, M. Hale, J. Paisley

The workgroup, in part, reported that the academic support backpack is a centralized location in the student portal where students will see suggested academic support resources customized to their individual needs; is determined by synthesizing data from a variety of sources such as students' demographic data (CCCApply), current class enrollment (SIS), educational goal (SIS), and the student's self-identified needs (CCCApply & Award Spring); is the list of academic supports which will live on the SRJC website on a dedicated page for "Academic Supports"; and constitutes the academic support contents of the "backpack."

[Read the Full Report by M. Hale, E. Dale, and J. Paisley Here](#)

CONSENT

President J. Thompson called for a vote on the slate of three Consent items:

1. Addition of Signatory to Exchange Bank Accounts – Administrative Assistant Natalia Haworth.
2. Recommending the Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) Reviewed by Educational Policy and Coordinating Council (7, 5) to the Board of Trustees.
3. Continue with Remote Meetings of the Academic Senate.

A roll-call vote was called, and the Consent Items were unanimously approved.

ACTION

None.

DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Hiring Procedure (Ed. Code 87360)
 - a. Status of Faculty Hiring Procedure Draft

Shall the Senate recommend that progress-to-date on procedure 4.3.2P be forwarded to the Vice President of Human Resources for administrative review and consideration by the Board, so that revisions may be implemented this spring?

Senators voiced concerns regarding clarity on the work completed to date and which sections would be forwarded to the Board; regarding timeline challenges as specific to existing policies for the Spring 2022 term as new changes are made; regarding impact on hiring committees already underway; and regarding whether the mark-up draft that is being discussed is the specific item to move forward.

J. Thompson clarified that the AS has finished review of the *Recruitment, Timeline, Responsibilities, and Emergency Hiring* sections, and those sections would be forwarded. Senators also voiced concerns regarding the reasoning for "piecemealing" the document for intention of implementing Spring 2022 or for informational purposes, and the potential for undue stress or disruption to hiring committees already in progress.

J. Thompson noted that the Board of Trustees has communicated a sense of impatience about the Senate's timeline in revising and reviewing the Faculty Hiring procedure and noted that a vote to move the progress-to-date draft would be seen as a good-faith effort as the AS continues to work on the rest of the document.

A senator stated that a lot of the revisions to date work are in favor of equity practices; that there are no equity trainings currently in place; and that there is not adequate DEIA representation within the current hiring practices for Spring 2022 as already underway.

T. Jacobson moved that the progress-to-date draft be moved from Discussion to Action; J. Stover seconded the motion.

A Point of Order was made, noting that all that was needed was to move the existing Discussion item to Action, not to add new language as the item was being moved from Discussion to Action.

A roll call vote was called, and the Motion passed with unanimous approval. The Item will be moved from Discussion to Action.

b. Definitions Regarding Student Participation

Shall the Academic Senate recommend that the Faculty Hiring Procedure identify options for student participation and a mechanism for approving departmental innovations regarding student participation?

J. Thompson introduced the topic and reminded the AS that at the February 2 meeting, Senators approved a motion that students “shall” be included in the faculty hiring process.

Senator J. Stover made a motion to move from Discussion to Action and the Executive Committee develop a list of options including department choice; Senator B. Reaves seconded.

A Point of Order was made regarding moving from Discussion to Action with the additional direction. Senator Stover clarified the motion was made in this way because it has been made clear in the last two meetings that the AS is asking that a menu of options be included in deliberations; noted that it was clear that including department choice was important; and felt that it was clear that the AS wants to move forward in considering specific options for student participation in the faculty hiring process.

Past-President Flyswithhawks reiterated that the motion, at its core, is to move from Discussion to Action and that further discussion can still happen at the Action level.

Opposing senators addressed concerns that creating the options list could create inconsistencies; requiring student participation has been a complex discussion and has not been finished; the “menu of options” needs to be thought out carefully; and each department should have the freedom to make its own choices.

Senator T. Jacobson called for the vote. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the motion with 25 Yes and 1 No as follows:

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan-Reylea –
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
A. Oliver – yes

B. Reaves – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
H. Skoonberg –
yes
N. Slovak - yes
J. Stover – yes
K. Valenzuela – no
S. Whyly – yes
S. Winston (Proxy
L. Aspinall) – yes

c. Composition of Screening and Interviewing Committee (SIC)

What shall be the Senate's recommendation(s) regarding composition of screening and interviewing committees?

J. Thompson reintroduced the topic; focused the discussion on the current draft and need to revise to reflect Senate recommendations; announced that the Executive Committee (EC) discussed the pros and cons of straw polling and is moving towards the phrasing "is there any objection to moving on" or "are there any objections" to keep track of the will of the body; and mentioned that votes can follow.

Senators suggested that deans or students outside of the discipline should not be included in the screening of credentials and should be separated from the selection of candidates; spoke to the need of expertise when reviewing resumes, transcripts, and teaching demonstrations; mentioned examples of STEM and performing demonstration skills where non-discipline committee members may not catch discipline-specific mistakes or shortcomings; noted the need for deans as only back up or when absolutely necessary; voiced concerns that breaking up the committee into two phases could create biases, complications, and difficulties in reaching consensus; expressed concern that splitting the phases would create unequal treatment of hiring candidates; voiced concerns for Associate Faculty Members' privacy; opposed having transcripts and personal statements in the hands of students or future students; acknowledged that student participation and interaction in teaching demonstrations is helpful; and noted that students might not catch a candidate's discipline-specific error.

J. Thompson redirected the conversation back to the topic at hand: the composition of the SIC and how it should be composed.

Senators suggested using a percentage or ratio of faculty members in lieu of specific numbers when composing a SIC; noted that a percentage would allow smaller departments to still have a majority of individuals with discipline expertise to make an informed decision; spoke to the value of including diverse and non-discipline-specific members; mentioned that discipline expertise is only one concern of the hiring process; stressed that the Senate is taking a critical look at the hiring policies to ensure that SRJC is not "repeating our sins" by hiring mainly white educators; and noted the importance of risk-taking and the inclusion of DEIA and pedagogy experts on SICs.

J. Thompson summarized Senator voices; noted the desire for SICs that are diverse and include discipline experts; stated that she is hearing concerns over privacy issues; and asked if the AS was getting close to synthesizing ideas for a motion that integrates Senators' ideas.

President-Elect Persons stated that Title 5 stresses the importance of discipline-specific minimum qualifications but also calls for "a sensitivity to, and understanding of, the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students."

T. Jacobson motioned to move this Discussion Item to an Action Item, and J. Stover seconded the motion.

Senators addressed concerns that motions are not being made on specific language; expressed concern about generalization that will lead to more discussion after being placed on the Action agenda; and stated that there should be a more productive discussion before making a vote.

A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the motion with 15 Yes and 11 No as follows:

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall– yes
A. Atilgan-Reylea –
yes
F. Avila – yes
V. Bertsch – yes
S. Brumbaugh – no
J. Bush – yes
J. Carlin-Goldberg
– no

S. Cavales Doolan
– yes
A. Donegan – no
J. Fassler – no
M. Hale – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
T. Johnson – yes
J. Kosten – yes
J. Kmetko – no
D. Lemmer – yes

A. Oliver – no
B. Reaves – yes
E. Schmidt – no
H. Skoonberg – no
N. Slovak – no
J. Stover – yes
K. Valenzuela – no
S. Whylly – no
S. Winston (Proxy
L. Aspinall) – yes

INFORMATION

1. Rising Scholars Network Grant Opportunity – R. Findling

R. Findling informed the AS that SRJC houses the Second Chance, IGNITE, and Rising Scholars Network for formerly and currently incarcerated students; noted the \$10 million dollars of competitive funding opportunity available from the Chancellor's Office; mentioned the application was released on January 21st and the deadline to submit is March 21st; reported Second Chance is an on-site student service program first implemented in Fall 2018 which maintains a dedicated counselor and student success coach, provides direct student aid, free expungement assistance, scholarships, support letters, and weekly support group meetings, and provides partnership with probation department, treatment centers, Juvenile Hall, and other agencies in Sonoma County; reported that IGNITE [Inspiring GreatNess Inside Through Education] is SRJC's in-custody education program within our two local jails (Main Adult Detention Facility and the North County Detention Facility); noted the provision of monthly meetings with all IGNITE faculty and SRJC support staff; noted all courses are 6-week 1-1.5 units with course designations CSKLS, CUL, COUN, HOSP; noted it serves as a pipeline to the Second Chance Program upon release; noted IGNITE service to formerly and currently incarcerated is core to the CCC mission; recognized these students belong to multiple equity groups such as DRD, BIPOC, Foster Youth, First Gen, EOPS; mentioned there are 20,000 students being served worldwide; noted SRJC is one of 56 on-campus programs and one of 23 jail programs; reported 50 CCCs will receive \$100,000 each starting 7/1/2022 through a competitive process; noted SRJC is well-positioned as a model program recognized throughout the state, and; mentioned those working on application include Robert Holcomb, Li Collier, Pedro Avila, Stacie Sather, and Rhonda Findling.

ADJOURNMENT

5:02 p.m.