



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: March 15, 2023
TIME: 3:15 p.m.
LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini Senate Chambers 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 (remote), J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, W. Downey, J. Fassler, T. Johnson, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, P. Ozbirinci (remote), N. Persons, S. Rosen, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, J. Stover

ABSENT B. Barajas, G. Garcia (proxy L. Larsen), T. Jacobson (proxy T. Johnson)

GUESTS J. Smotherman

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 Senator H. Skoonberg.

OPEN FORUM

J. Stover invited senators and faculty to attend the [We the Future Social Justice Conference](#) that is being held at SRJC Petaluma on Friday, April 21st from 9:00 AM to 2:30 PM; looking to round out presentations and are in need of experts in disability rights (post-pandemic) and/or ethnicity and identity as it relates to the new world of 2023; will accept all workshops and proposals that address social justice, workers' rights, education access and community care; will offer a zoom option for each session; and are in need volunteers for the day of the event.

MINUTES

Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg moved to approve the [March 1, 2023 minutes](#). A roll-call vote was called, and the motion passed with 23 yes votes and 1 abstention.

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA – None

REPORTS

1. [President's Report](#) — N. Persons answered questions related to the President's Report including the College Council survey, which was sent to all committee chairs and asked for follow up requests if survey requests were not received; and, Dr. J. Smotherman clarified that he is the primary contact for district wide grant applications, Dean. C. Prince is the point of contact for grants applications that primarily focus on Academic Affairs, and that Student Services will have a primary contact who is yet to be identified. President Persons went on to acknowledge the SRJC President / Superintendent Finalist Forums will take place Monday March 27th and 28th; noted the nomination period for senators and president-elect had passed; noted Areas 4 & 5 will be at-large elections and encouraged faculty to run; and noted her nomination for Dr. J. Stover as President-Elect, who will be running.

2. PRPP & Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives Update - J. Smotherman reported on the Strategic Planning Goals and Objectives; clarified the objectives were not board policy and not required to be passed by the board; answered whether there is mention of SRJC campus security in light of what has happened in our community recently, and clarified that there is not specific language indicating campus security, however, the goals and objectives are broad and can be applied to many different aspects of campus security objectives; reported that a survey was sent out to students in Fall 2022 with an 11% response rate, out of which 94% to 97% of students reported feeling respected on their campuses; and that work continues to make sure all students feel respected and supported.

[SRJC Strategic Planning: Goals and Objectives Town Hall Input Workshop](#)
[Fall 2022 Student Survey](#)

CONSENT – None

ACTION

1. 4.3.2P Faculty Hiring Procedure

President N. Persons opened the topic by reminding the body of the time sensitive nature of the work; asked for consideration of the well-being of the College; asked Senators to consider supporting procedures “as something you can live with [and] without compromising your values”; and opened the discussion on Section V. Interviewing.

M. Anderman moved to adopt the workgroup recommendation regarding Section V (Interviewing) of 4.3.2P, seconded. A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 25 unanimous yes votes.

Moving onto Section VI. Selection of Contract Faculty, the following edits were made: the two sentences of section A.3. were struck entirely and moved as follows: one sentence was moved to conclude Section A and not be a part of the numbered bullets; and the other sentence was added at the end of A.2. Also, in Section C, the wording “needed improvement” was changed to “concern”. Other suggested edits were discussed but not adopted in the document.

Senators commented on the confusion of the ranking of candidates in the first paragraph of Section VI.A., and conflicts with Section V.E.2.; however, it was clarified that Section V and VI are two distinct processes at two different points in the process and are not in conflict with each other.

A point of order was made that Senator P. Ozbirinci, who was participating remotely (via AB2449) had her hand up to speak but was not called on; she noted that the changes to Section A were sufficient and withdrew her hand.

President Persons called for the question. A point of order was made regarding the lack of a motion on the floor.

J. Stover moved to adopt the workgroup recommendation regarding Section VI (Selection of Regular Faculty) of 4.3.2P as amended, seconded. A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 25 unanimous yes votes.

M. Ohkubo opened the discussion of Section VII and noted the intention to remove the section entirely from 4.3.2P and add/move the remaining language to Section II: Timeline.

A point of clarification asked if a potential motion would be to strike section VII, answered “yes”.

A point of clarification inquired if a vote was needed to reopen Section II, which was clarified, via point of order, that Section II. Timeline had already been reopened at a previous meeting.

M. Ohkubo moved to abolish Section VII. Adjunct [Associate] Pool and move the remaining language into Section II. Timeline, seconded.

A question was asked whether this pertains to emergency hiring and was clarified that Emergency Hiring portion was decided in previous years.

A roll call vote was called, and the motion passed with 25 unanimous yes votes. The Academic Senate approved to abolish Section VII. Adjunct [Associate] Pool and moved the remaining language into Section II. Timeline.

A point of clarification was asked whether the body now needs to vote to approve Section II: Timeline or if it is immediately adopted; it was clarified that the language it now moved to section II. But still needs to be approved and adopted as amended.

E. Schmidt moved to adopt the workgroup recommendation regarding Section II: Timeline of 4.3.2P as amended, seconded.

L. Aspinall moved to vote by acclamation, seconded with no objections.

The roll call question by acclamation was called and the motion to adopt the workgroup recommendation regarding Section II: Timeline of 4.3.2P as amended was passed with 25 yes votes by acclamation.

This concludes the Academic Senate revision of the 4.3.2P Faculty Hiring Procedure.

DISCUSSION

1. 10+1 Review

President Persons opened the discussion by stating the Academic Senate currently holds numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, & 7 as areas of “primarily relied upon by” the District; asked the Body whether there was a need for discussion for any of those areas to not be listed as an area of primacy; heard no objection; and invited discussion on the remaining areas of the 10+1 and whether they also need to be included as an area of primacy.

Senator comments included: questioned as to why the Academic Senate does not ask for all 10 be primarily relied upon, it was clarified that all colleges are different, and it is up to our Academic Senate to review and present to the District but that the AS can not just declare all 10+1 be primary, but the Board would have to submit in writing that they disagree with our recommendation; was recommended that we ask for all 10 to be included; opposition comments stated that it would increase workload to the Senate body if every facet of the 10+1 be brought to the Senate for approval; a targeted approach would be a more beneficial path rather than ask for all 10; and to be thoughtful of other shared governance roles who share in these responsibilities.

Conversations continued regarding the purpose of the Senate as related to 10+1 matters whether it is relied primarily upon or as consultation; advocated for stronger inclusion of the Senate voice in matters pertaining to faculty development; and noted Senate participation as already present in May 2021 discussions and votes in support of DEIA professional development and (half of) flex opportunities.

President Persons acknowledged comments about Senate purview on faculty development and noted conflict at the District level as represented in a current MOU which conflicts with AS Bylaws.

Comments continued that Senate bylaws can and should be reviewed annually.

L. Aspinall moved to extend time by 4 minutes, seconded with no objections.

L. Aspinall moved to advance the Discussion Item to Action, seconded. The roll call vote was called and passed with 25 unanimous yes votes.

INFORMATION

None

ADJOURNMENT

5:00 p.m.