



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: April 25, 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

L. Aspinall, S. Avasthi, B. Barajas, V. Bertsch, J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, W. Downey, J. Fassler, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, P. Ozbirinci, N. Persons, S. Rosen, H. Skoonberg, J. Stover

ABSENT M. Anderman, A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Brumbaugh, J. Bush, G. Garcia, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, A. Oliver, E. Schmidt.

GUESTS S. Martin, K. Frindell Teuscher

CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting was called to order at 3:17 p.m. by President N. Persons. The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by J. Stover.

OPEN FORUM – None

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA – None

DISCUSSION

1. *Academic Senate input regarding Faculty Self-Evaluation option

President Persons opened the topic by thanking senators for attending the extra meeting; thanked the ad-hoc members for engaging in this important conversation; noted that ad hoc members should join the AFA closed session at 3:40 pm (and not at 3:00 pm start time) in the Doyle Library 4th floor reading room in support of AFA's confidentiality on other closed session topics.

A review of the survey responses provided by AFA indicated:

- Should faculty members with tenure or offer rights have the option of self-evaluation?
 - Yes: 81%, No: 19%
- How often would it be appropriate?
 - Every other cycle: 46%, Every third cycle: 20%, Every fourth cycle: 34%
- General "yes" reasons:
 - Opportunity for self-reflection and analysis, emphasizes trust and faculty professionalism, reduces anxiety, efficiency and flexibility.
- General "no" reasons:
 - Lack of student feedback, direct peer feedback, and accountability.

Senator Statements in support of self-evaluation options included: consensus that faculty wish to self-evaluate for those who hold tenure or offer rights; suggestion to have evaluations either every third cycle or every other cycle; allows those faculty members who are pulled in multiple directions the convenience to take care of their own evaluations; surveys can be sent to students every semester to help support self evals; and difficulties and challenges in evaluating other persons and addressing concerns.

Senator statements of concern re: self-evaluation options included: lack of student feedback and loss of student voice in faculty evaluations; possible dishonesty among faculty in critical self-assessment; undermining of District's ability to maintain Course Outlines of Record (CORs);

concern over accessibility for students to evaluate their teachers that may not understand specific terms; current evaluations support continuous improvement and self-evaluations do not; the value of peer observation in teaching and in science; “you don’t know what you don’t know” and the loss of opportunity to learn more; makes it seem like a box to be checked off for the district rather than engagement in meaningful conversations and learning opportunities; question regarding whether there has been a self-evaluation that has admitted to needed improvement; and concerns about the population responding and surveyed and the integrity of the data collected.

A point of clarification was asked whether the survey was sent to both associate and contract faculty and whether the responses were disaggregated as such; it was clarified that it was sent to both associate and contract faculty, and that data was not collected as related to those statuses and how many responses came from each category.

Additional Senator questions and comments of concern included: that self-evaluations are already in place; that a department chair and a Dean can make the decision to deny a self-eval without explanation; that the survey population size is very small, the questions seem leading, and it is hard to make a decision based on the survey; that if faculty is trying to be the best versions of themselves as educators, in person evals are the best option because they include peer reviews and student comments; curiosity regarding whether other colleges allow self-evaluations as stand-alone options; suggestions to include student feedback with self-evaluations; suggestion to send out another survey with more detailed and non-leading questions; value of evaluations as an opportunity to learn and share your passion and professionalism with peers; and curiosity as to why evaluations are only every 3 years.

A point of clarification was asked if the Ad-hoc group would have access to individual responses; it was clarified that they can be shown to the ad-hoc group in closed session.

A point of clarification was asked if a department chair can make the decision for their department to not have individual self-evaluations, and if they can just make a blanket statement that they will not have self-evaluation; it was clarified that it they could with an evidence-based reason why no one in the department could have a self-evaluation, and was also noted as an unlikely option; and it was noted that the evidence-based reason would not be shared publicly and has never happened before.

Time expired on the topic. President Persons noted that the goal to provide feedback on what the ad hoc committee needed to bring to the closed session was met, thanked Senators for their input, and closed the meeting.

[View Summary of Results of AFA Self-Evaluation Survey Presentation here.](#)

INFORMATION – None

ADJOURNMENT

4:16 p.m.