



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 4th, 2023

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers, Room 4638
Petaluma: Room 628, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/739337730>

PRESENT:

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Avasthi, A. Donegan, W. Downey, M. Ferguson, M. Hale, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, D. McCall, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, P. Ozbirinci, J. Perez, S. Rosen, E. Schmidt, N. Slovak J. Stover, P. Usina, C. Williams, A. Yu

ABSENT:

J. Fassler, G. Garcia

GUESTS:

L. Beach, A. Donegan, A. Forrester, B. Thomsen

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President Persons. The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by Senator Ozbirinci.

OPEN FORUM:

1. Brianna Thomsen read a statement on behalf of the Psychology Department, encouraging the Academic Senate to determine how to systematically include principles of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Access (DEIA) in all elements of the curriculum process. Examples were cited of activities their department has engaged in to this end. [Read B. Thomsen and C. Williams' full statement here.](#)
2. John Stover read a statement on behalf of the Sociology Department. The statement spoke to the Sociology Department's solidarity with the Psychology Department. Statement addressed updates to Sociology Course Outline of Records to reflect their commitment to DEIA. [Read J. Stover's full statement here.](#)

MINUTES:

[Minutes of September 20, 2023](#) (for information only; posted too late to vote on 10/4/23)

Corrections to 9/20/23 minutes:

- E. Schmidt requested that the minutes reflect their objection to non-faculty participating in selection of faculty for District Education Plan, as it is an abdication of the faculty's duties and responsibilities.
- D. Lemmer indicated there is a spelling error in the District Education Plan item.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

A. Donegan moved to adjust the agenda for the Professional Development report to be given after 4pm.

No objections.

REPORTS:

1. [President's Report](#) – N. Persons

Highlights from the President's report included:

- Community of Practices will be taking place in spring.
- Two calls have gone out for faculty participation the District Education Plan and Waitlist work groups.
- Guided Pathways Town Halls are being held, with two more happening this week.
- Provided information under what circumstances it is appropriate to abstain.
- Shared information regarding Peer Online Course Review (POCR) in preparation for today's POCR agenda item. As a teaching college we must have some sort of POCR in place, however it does not have to be the one developed

by the California Virtual College (CVC). We have time to pilot a process. Matters concerning compensation will be referred to AFA. A free, 60-hour training program is offered through CVC for reviewers. Courses are reviewed in four areas: content presentation, interaction with students, assessment and accessibility

CONSENT:

None.

ACTION:

1. Peer Online Course Review (POCR) – L. Beach
[Peer Online Course Review \(POCR\) Explained](#)

Description from agenda:

At the recommendation of the Academic Senate last year, SRJC has joined the California Virtual College (CVC) as both a home and teaching college. Implementation is beginning. All Teaching Colleges in the CVC are required to have a POCR process. The Office of Distance Education seeks Academic Senate recommendation regarding how to proceed.

Discussion included the following themes and ideas:

- It was suggested that we put together a group in house to develop and pilot a course review process.
- According to CVC, review must be done using their rubric.
- Recommend DE put out a call for volunteers to participate.
- We are already using a similar rubric at SRJC for the Online College Project. Suggested we use this tool versus starting from scratch.
- It was asked how often the POCR process is reviewed. What are the opportunities for participation? Answer yes, it is reviewed, most recently within the last two years. Rubric was designed and reviewed by faculty in the CCC system.
- Our own BOT policy requires a review every 6 years for accessibility, this is separate from the CVC required POCR, but DE is working to align these review processes.
- In favor of having more local control
- It was asked what happens after course is reviewed. If course does not align with rubric and instructor chooses not to make suggested changes, course will not receive badge.

J. Stover made the following motion, motion seconded:

I move that the AS establish a senate task force with the purposes of establishing a POCR process as drawn from the sample POCR pilot process already presented to us and referenced below.

Sample POCR Pilot Process:

Step 1: Identify 5-7 Faculty Reviewers

Process requires two reviewers per course

Ideal to select a variety of faculty roles/disciplines

Step 2: Reviewers complete the @ONE POCR training course

Free 6-week course

Approximately 10-hours per week

Step 3: Identify 3 faculty volunteers to submit courses for review

Potentially could begin with Online College Project faculty/courses since that process aligns courses with the rubric

The motion was discussed and the following was raised:

- Support for the resolution was expressed as well as for local input on process.
- Certain aspects of the CVC's POCR process could be interpreted to be evaluative of faculty (ex: timely and regular feedback from instructor)

- Badges follow the instructor; course is only badged when instructor whose section was reviewed is teaching the course.
- Suggested that a timeline be added to the motion and that we use the academic year to complete work.

J. Stover moved to extend the time by 4 minutes.

No objections.

T. Johnson moved to amend the motion so that the work would be concluded this academic year and to strike the word temporary, motion seconded:

The AS establish a ~~temporary~~ Senate task force with the purposes of establishing a POCR process as drawn from the sample POCR pilot process already presented to us and referenced below *and report back to the end of Academic Senate before the end of AY2023-24.*

Amendment passed, 25 yes, 1 no.

M. Anderman-Y	M. Hale-Y	J. Perez-Y
L. Aspinall- Y	T. Jacobson-Y	S. Rosen-Y
A. Atilgan Relyea- Y	T. Johnson-Y	E. Schmidt-Y
S. Avasthi- Y	L. Larsen-Y	N. Slovak- Y
A. Donegan-Y	D. Lemmer-Y	J. Stover-Y
W. Downey-Y	D. McCall-Y	P. Usina-Y
J. Fassler (proxy Donegan)-Y	G. Morre-N	C. Williams-Y
M. Ferguson- Y	M. Ohkubo-Y	A.Yu-Y
G. Garcia (Proxy Larsen)-Y	P. Ozbirinci- Y	

Discussion of the perfected motion continued:

- Concerns raised that there is an evaluative component of faculty in this process, which could be interpreted as an out of cycle evaluation.
- Concern raised regarding compensation for training
- Process is voluntary for faculty
- POCR Process has been well received state-wide

T. Jacobson called for question.

Perfected motion was voted on:

AS establish a senate task force with the purposes of establishing a POCR process as drawn from the sample POCR pilot process already presented to us and referenced below and report back to the end of Academic Senate before the end of AY2023-24.

Sample POCR Pilot Process:

Step 1: Identify 5-7 Faculty Reviewers

Process requires two reviewers per course

Ideal to select a variety of faculty roles/disciplines

Step 2: Reviewers complete the @ONE POCR training course

Free 6-week course

Approximately 10-hours per week

Step 3: Identify 3 faculty volunteers to submit courses for review

Potentially could begin with Online College Project faculty/courses since that process aligns courses with the rubric

Motion passed 17 yes, 9 no.

M. Anderman-Y

L. Aspinall- Y

A. Atilgan Relyea- Y

S. Avasthi- Y

A. Donegan-N

W. Downey-N

J. Fassler (proxy Donegan)-N

M. Ferguson- N

G. Garcia (Proxy Larsen)-Y

M. Hale-Y

T. Jacobson-Y

T. Johnson-Y

L. Larsen-Y

D. Lemmer-Y

D. McCall-N

G. Morre-N

M. Ohkubo-Y

P. Ozbirinci- Y

J. Perez-N

S. Rosen-Y

E. Schmidt-N

N. Slovak- N

J. Stover-Y

P. Usina-Y

C. Williams-Y

A. Yu-Y

BREAK

REPORTS: Continued

2. Professional Development Coordinators – A. Donegan and A. Forrester, 5 min.

[Overview of New Faculty Professional Learning Program Fall 2023](#)

- Please send ideas for professional development programming and questions to coordinators.
- Call will be going out for a Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, assignment starts in spring.

DISCUSSION:

1. Senate Goals

[Academic Senate Fall 2023 Retreat Goals and Priorities Notes](#)

Description from agenda:

The Academic Senate identified ongoing and anticipated topics for deliberation at its fall retreat on August 25, 2023. The Academic Senate now needs use these as it identifies priorities to address during the 2023-24 academic year.

Discussion included following themes, ideas and questions:

- Textbook Instructional Materials Committee has been working on resources to support faculty in identifying and selecting culturally responsive course materials.
- While this list is entitled “Senate Goals”, they read more as priorities. Senate bylaws state goals will be developed at annual retreats.
- Discussion of whether goals should be ranked, and if so could the ranking occur outside of the Senate meeting.
- Concerns expressed about ranking as needs emerge constantly that change the order of which topics get addressed.
- Proposed that we interpret language in bylaws in the broadest sense.
- Questions regarding how are these goals/priorities are used. And if they inform the formation of agendas. EC members indicated goals do inform agenda development.
- Requested the Senate create a resolution addressing where we are headed in regards to online vs. face to face instruction.

M. Ohkubo motioned to extend time by two minutes, seconded.

No objections.

T. Johnson motioned to move item to action on the next agenda, seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Student Success: Policy Recommendations – 15 min.

Description from agenda:

Generative AI has arrived and is actively being used by students and faculty in higher education. How will we approach Generative AI at SRJC to provide faculty support for instructional design and ensure student success in the effective and ethical use of this technology? What policy/procedure, faculty professional development, and other efforts are needed? What recommendations might we make to the District, and what support might we want from the District?

Discussion included the following themes, questions and ideas:

- Is Turnitin a sufficient response? Can it be used to identify plagiarized work?
- Chat GPT 4.0 (paid version), was not being utilized by Turnitin, however unsure if this is still accurate.
- Constituents are sharing concerns, some are assigning work during class to ensure work is being created by students.
- ED Source has articles specific to this topic.
- Academic Senate has a role to play in this discussion, particularly in addressing this in policy and procedure. 3.11P and 3.11p, which address academic integrity may need to be updated to reflect these concerns, as well as to address the holistic nature of the student and nurture growth for students.
- Students need to understand how to use these tools responsibly. APA will be holding webinar on this, specific to ethical use.
- How do we create assignments that make the use of AI moot? How do we embrace AI? Its here and not going anywhere.
- Some instructors have developed syllabus statement regarding AI use parameters, including statement about use of AI will require instructor's prior permission.
- Modern Language Association has developed guidelines for citing AI sources.

3. Faculty Evaluations

[DEIA Competencies Criteria DEIA](#)

[Guidance Memo](#)

[Form 400 Regulation Text DEIA Evaluation and Tenure Review AFA](#)

[Contract Article 14A](#)

[AFA Contract Article 14B](#)

[AFA Side Letter on Regular Continuing Evaluations \(includes Self-evaluation\)](#)

Description from agenda:

According to the Board agenda of September 12, the All Faculty Association (AFA) and District have reopened Article 14A and 14B: Evaluations, stating they "have an interest in a fair and effective evaluation process, making changes that would improve the clarity or process. The District and AFA have an interest in negotiating the effects of recent legislation Amending Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, to Include Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Standards in the Evaluation and Tenure Review of District Employees." In addition, the AFA side letter on Faculty Self-evaluations was extended through the fall 2023 semester. Finally, the Academic Senate has received faculty requests to discuss how faculty evaluation reviews are conducted in different modalities. What shall the Academic Senate's recommendations be in these areas?

Discussion of this item included the following:

- Constituent request for online instruction evaluation processes and DEIA competencies addressed

- Concerns raised regarding evaluations being open and negotiated right now, we while are simultaneously holding Senate discussions. Concerned that the Senate in violation of employment law.
- President clarified that this is one of the areas Senate has the right to discuss as outlined in Ed code.

Item will return on the next agenda as time ran out.

INFORMATION:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

5:00 p.m.

DRAFT

DRAFT