ACADEMIC SENATE

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

PRESENT

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, F. Avila, V. Bertsch, S. Brumbaugh, J. Bush, J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, J. Fassler, B. Flyswithhawks, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, J. Kosten, J. Kmetko, D. Lemmer, A. Oliver, N. Persons, B. Reaves, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, J. Stover, J. Thompson, K. Valenzuela, S. Whylly, S. Winston

ABSENT   None

GUESTS   President Frank Chong, SGA President Delashay Carmona Benson

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. Stover.

OPEN FORUM

1. D. Carmona-Benson, Student Government (SGA) President, commented on the ongoing discussion concerning the inclusion of students in the faculty hiring process, stating that she feels faculty fear change, not students; spoke as representative of the student body and for the many students who came forward in Fall in support of student participation on faculty hiring committees; asked for reflection on the nature of opposition to including students; noted that students have expertise to bring forward as based on their classroom learning experiences; expressed concern students would not have a voice in the process despite the expressed student interest and ongoing advocacy; acknowledged the 10+1 purview of Senate, and asked for the 9+1 rights of SGA and their resolution to likewise be recognized; shared the voicing of her opinion on social media, with flyers, and other means; expressed that ongoing advocacy in representing the interests of the student body would continue, and; concluded by expressing her respect for the Academic Senate and calling for actions, and not just words, going forward.

2. E. Schmidt reminded the Senate that adjunct faculty do not get a vote on the Hiring Committee, and noted that "adjunct" had been crossed out and replaced with "emeritus" on the mark up draft currently under review; insisted that if students were to gain a seat on faculty hiring committees, then adjunct faculty should be appointed as well; reminded senators that there are more adjunct faculty than contract faculty and many have been teaching at SRJC for decades, and; stated how unfriendly, unequal, and unsupportive it felt to see adjuncts excluded.

3. F. Chong welcomed everyone to spring, 2022, and thanked faculty, classified, and administrators for working tirelessly to start the semester; reminded those present that SRJC is managing the Omicron surge as best they can and are committed to safety and choice in providing remote (currently around 60%) and in person (currently around 40%) instruction; announced that SRJC is recruiting 36 contract faculty this spring, or slightly more than 10% of the overall number of current contract faculty (300) and includes several new positions; thanked those who are retiring from teaching and welcomed forthcoming opportunities for instructors in new areas, and; wished everyone a great semester ahead.

MINUTES

H. Skoonberg moved to approve the December 15 minutes; J. Carlin-Goldberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes with 21 yes votes and 2 abstentions, with 1 in absence as follows:

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

REPORTS

1. President's Report – J. Thompson

   J. Thompson welcomed Senators back; introduced the new administrative assistant, Natalia Haworth, and two new senators, Shawn Brumbaugh, serving the Area 2 vacancy, and Jan Kmetko, filling the Area 6 vacancy, for spring 2022; reminded the Senate that there are two remaining senator vacancies in Area 3 (one semester) and Area 10 (until early April), and; noted the deadline for Area 3 is Wednesday January 26th at 4 pm, while the Area 10 recruitment will remain open until filled; all interested contract faculty are invited to apply.

   J. Thompson reported that VP K. Jolley forwarded a recommendation to the President's Cabinet for the purchase of the Guided Pathways Program Mapper software following a demo and discussions with invested constituencies; highlighted the software will help students explore SRJC certificates and majors, recommended semester-by-semester course sequences, and variations among course requirements for majors based on specific transfer institutions' unique requirements; shared that the Board of Trustees approved an expenditure for the student-facing website redesign for approximately $80,000 for an "Award of Contract for Guided Pathways Website Pathway Consultant;" thanked GP workgroup members for their ongoing efforts in moving the work forward, and; shared plans to schedule GP workgroup reports at upcoming Senate meetings this semester.

   J. Thompson shared that College Council plans to make progress on a redesign of the College's governance system and came up with a draft of principles at their last meeting (December 2021) which will guide their work going forward; have continued to make progress on a draft for a retreat scheduled for January 31, and; reminded those unfamiliar with College Council that it broadly represents all constituent groups with members including Vice Presidents, Presidents of Student Government, SEIU, Classified and Academic Senate, AFA, as well as one student and two Academic Senate additional appointees.

   The Educational Planning and Coordinating Council (EPCC) is developing a plan to ensure that the ongoing review of policies and procedures occurs in a deliberate, sustainable way; moves away from a reactive mode of pushing through a lot of policy review each accreditation cycle, and; includes the goal of identifying the scope of the work and evenly distributing it throughout the year. Additional goals include: requiring a process that respects the Senate's role in policy advisement as falling within the 10 + 1 areas of purview, and; emphasizing there are approximately 150 policies and procedures relevant to the Senate's responsibility in need to review, and; expressing desire for an appropriate process in which EPCC can assist the Senate without weakening its role.

   J. Thompson reminded Senators that the spring election cycle is coming up, encouraged

Senators and their colleagues to run, and that the nomination period will close Wednesday, February 23rd at Noon.

A number of important Senate dates were also shared: on Monday, January 24, 3 to 5 pm, Stephanie Curry and Michelle Bean from the ASCCC Executive Committee will represent on how Senate work and DEIA work come together; the Spring Retreat on Friday, February 11, 10 am to 3 pm, and for the last 1.5 to 2 hours of the retreat, Cheryl Aschenbach and LaTonya Parker from the ASCCC Executive Committee will present on Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies for Ethnic Studies, and; the ASCCC Spring Plenary on April 7, 8, and 9, stressing that higher participation improves our own Senate, both in terms of content and process.

J. Thompson concluded by acknowledging it was Amy Quinn's last meeting as Administrative Assistant and expressed her gratitude for Amy's service.

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

CONSENT

1. Continue with Remote Meetings of the Academic Senate

   A roll-call vote was called, and the Consent Item was approved with 23 yes votes, with 1 in absence as follows:

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

A point of order was called regarding that the Guided Pathways Mapping and Scheduling Workgroup did not specifically recommend the program mapper software under review. J. Thompson suggested a follow up discussion based on the content of the question occur at a later time.

ACTION

None

DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Hiring Procedure, 4.3.2P

   a. Student Participation in Faculty Hiring Processes

      J. Thompson reintroduced the topic of student participation in the Faculty Hiring procedure and encouraged the use of straw-polls to gauge support for ideas.

      Senators discussed opportunities for student participation in the Faculty Hiring process with comments and ideas including: supporting student voices in the faculty hiring process by creating a menu of choices that departments choose as specific to options for student involvement such as teaching demonstrations, non-voting/voting member, review of a writing prompt, and or informal talk with the candidate; highlighting there's a lot of common ground and that straw polls will be useful going forward; adding a requirement for departments to choose at least one option from the suggested menu of options for student involvement; adding skills demonstration to the menu of options; considering the effectiveness of multiple student voices as particular to teaching

demonstrations, versus one student's input on a hiring committee, and; expressing concerns for creating an exhaustive list of options as well as concerns for requiring departments and committees to utilize said options.

Discussion continued with senators observing that they were working to promote change in relation to hiring and onboarding practices specific to promoting equity, inclusion, and diversity at the college, and expressing concern that not making student involvement mandatory is contrary to that goal; agreeing with mandatory student participation but that it be done so as a non-voting member; not allowing student access to sensitive or confidential materials; expressing concern that not allowing students a vote is a waste of students' time and does not provide a measure for how departments are including students in a way that is valuable to them; remarking that part of this work emerged from the BSU and BLAC demands regarding the lack of faculty diversity, and; questioning how the college would continue to move towards a more equitable and diverse faculty if the student request to be a voting member on faculty hiring committees is not granted.

Other senators noted that the hiring process conversation may be oversimplified in terms of a "vote" and clarified the categorized scoring process that takes place during hiring, including some categories which are more subjective than others; suggested that students participate as a voting member for specific categories, such as teaching demonstrations, and utilize their specific student expertise to evaluate a candidate; supported mandatory student participation, as well as students being voting members of hiring committee; suggested that students join the interview process only after the screening process has concluded, which would eliminate concerns about students accessing confidential materials and keep credentialing review under faculty purview.

A suggestion was made to create several straw-polls regarding student participation and a menu of options for their involvement.

A first straw-poll was taken to identify if departments and hiring committees should be required to include a form of student participation in the hiring process: most senators (15 "yes" indications in zoom) agreed.

A second straw-poll was taken to identify if the Senate should prepare a menu of options for student participation from which departments will choose: most senators (22 "yes" indications in zoom) agreed.

A third straw-poll was taken to identify if there should be a way for departments to come up with a new idea for student participation that is not on the menu of options, and have that idea vetted; most senators (22 "yes" indications in zoom) agreed.

L. Aspinall motioned to extend the time on this topic by 5 minutes. J. Stover seconded the motion. There were no objections.

L. Aspinall motioned to move the Student Participation in Faculty Hiring processes item to the Action agenda for the next meeting. J. Stover seconded the motion.

A roll-call vote was called and it was unanimously approved with 24 yes votes.

b. Composition of Screening and Interviewing Committees (SICs)

J. Thompson introduced the topic of the Senate's recommendations for the composition of the SICs and posed the questions of who and how many should be involved.

A Senator raised a question regarding the current document under review as specific to current board policy and the current will of the Senate, neither of which seem to be represented in the draft document posted and under consideration and making it difficult for new senators to know the history and context of these issues. Specific examples

were noted regarding the number of committee members and the removal of adjuncts from serving on committees. J. Thompson provided a brief history of the draft document and the Senate's actions and encouraged Senators to review the Resources page on the Senate website, with follow up discussions to continue.

Comments and suggestions regarding SICs from Senators included: including both adjuncts and emeritus faculty as possible members; sharing the previous Senate's decision for replacing "adjunct" with "emeritus" was perhaps due to concerns about conflict of interest, and the possibility of adjuncts being future interviewees, versus emeritus faculty who would be unlikely to apply again.

A point of order was called regarding the process for the current draft document and senators were encouraged to review the document posted on the Senate's website that outlines the background and timeline for document under consideration; a recommendation was made that the Senate focus on a few emergent topics from today, for example adding adjuncts back into the process, or including students, and that the Executive Committee provide additional support documents to Senators via email so that they are prepared for further discussion at the next meeting, and a suggestion was made to perform straw-polls regarding the questions of including emeritus, adjunct, and students, and the number of committee members.

Additional suggestions and concerns voiced by the Senate included: expressing that adjunct committee members should be an exception, not a requirement, as it can feel awkward for faculty to serve on a hiring committee that screen and interview other adjunct faculty candidates, with whom they regularly work, and that another adjunct peer serving on the committee could experience the same, especially if the candidate is not hired; determining how adjuncts are chosen to serve on a committee; supporting the inclusion of an adjunct committee member to help with committee diversity, such as KAD has done; observing that the line noting students cannot be a voting member on faculty hiring committees is contradictory to creating a diverse committee and that should be removed from the language; omitting adjunct faculty from hiring committees is omitting approximately 75% of the faculty body; and acknowledgement that adjunct faculty are peers to full-time faculty as well, and not just to other adjunct faculty members.

A point of order was called in redirecting conversation as to be focused on the content of ideas and not in relation to specific persons or Senators.

Further discussion noted some smaller departments only have adjunct faculty, such as Adaptive P.E., indicating that they would need adjunct faculty on hiring committees; identified that the current policy allows classified staff to sit on faculty hiring committees, but their voting right is at the discretion of the department, and that the current draft has inconsistent or ambiguous language that could suggest classified staff automatically have voting rights, and; suggested that departments should be given as much discretion as possible to decide if a committee member should be voting or non-voting.

Reminders were made that the body is not constrained to the current draft and current Senators can make changes if they do not agree with previous decisions or language.

Senators commented on their appreciation for adjunct (associate) faculty members; advised to be careful when identifying adjunct and emeritus positions going forward, and ensure the correct language is being used in the document; stressed the difference between an expressed concern versus a perceived conflict of interest if adjunct professors sit on committees; questioned how adjunct and contract faculty are chosen to sit on committees and why that process might be conducted differently for each group; acknowledged the value of adjunct faculty sitting on committees as discipline experts; and expressed concern about the current draft document versus the board doc.

J. Thompson acknowledged that revisiting how the drafted document got to the current state would be beneficial for the Senate as they move forward with discussions.

c. Status of Faculty Hiring Procedure Draft

J. Thompson shared that the Board, Dr. Chong, and others would like to see the Senate move forward policy already reviewed that could be applied during the current hiring cycle; reminded the Senate that the Policy draft, including the Senate's Values Statement, had already been forwarded and will be utilized during the current hiring cycle, and; clarified that procedures only need one reading by the board.

Senators asked clarifying questions that verified only sections that have been thoroughly discussed and voted on by the Senate, not those currently being discussed, would be integrated into the current procedure and forwarded, and; clarified that those sections would be integrated into the procedure document posted on BoardDocs, not the draft created by a previous Senate.

Additional comments included: acknowledging practical reasons for forwarding an updated procedure draft, and that they will be many more cycles of hiring; and support for keeping the process moving so future Senates are not in the same position as the current Senate.

INFORMATION

None

ADJOURNMENT

5:00 p.m.