



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Minutes approved 12.06.2023

November 1, 2023, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers,
Room 4638

Petaluma: Room 628, Richard Call Bldg.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

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

ABSENT: L. Aspinall (proxy T. Jacobson), S. Rosen (proxy J. Stover)

GUESTS: T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, L. Larque, N. Slovak

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President Persons.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by Senator Lemmer.

[Full statement is available here.](#)

OPEN FORUM:

- **L. Larque:** Statement requesting respectful and non-disruptive open discussions when the topic is equity, diversity, and inclusion when advocating for the POCR. Statement continued with advocating for the POCR to address the needs of the community. [Full statement is available here.](#) (L. Larque was unable to attend and their statement was read by AS Admin Assistant)
- **T. Johnson:** Statement requesting future discussion on creating a joint Academic Senate and All Faculty Association Standing Committee “to create a joint standing committee in order to understand each other's positions and develop joint perspectives and priorities prior to negotiations of any shared purview.” [Full statement is available here.](#)
- **N. Slovak:** Statement regarding their experience attending an American Council of Learning Societies (ACLS) sponsored convening of 90 community college faculty professors (New York City, October 2023). Statement requested that Academic Senate to advocate for “all faculty in all disciplines and areas to receive funding, to attend at least one academic conference a year.” [Full statement is available here.](#)
- **T. Jacobson:** Statement advocating for POCR and including students in the conversation and recognizing that not all students can take all classes in person. Presented data regarding increased student success rate when online courses are POCR aligned. [Full statement is available here.](#)

MINUTES:

Request for amendment to minutes of AS Meeting on October 18, 2023:

- Senator Donegan requested that their Open Forum summary reflect that they requested that the Academic Senate “put on as an agenda item the fact that Dr. Chong vetoed a vote that this body took about funding professional development in connection with our discipline expertise. That that could be voted on and somehow it was vetoed.”
- Senator Slovak requested that their vote regarding discussing POCR in a private session be corrected to reflect that they had abstained from the vote (they did not vote “yes”).

Senator Ohkubo made a motion to approve minutes with amendments, motion was seconded.

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| M. Anderman - Y | M. Hale - Y | J. Perez - Y |
| L. Aspinall (by proxy)- Y | T. Jacobson - Y | S. Rosen (by proxy)- 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 - Y | G. Morre - Y | C. Williams - Y |
| M. Ferguson - Y | M. Ohkubo – y | A. Yu - Y |
| G. Garcia - Y | P. Ozbirinci - Abstain | |

Academic Senate Minutes for October 18, 2023, were approved as amended: 25 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain
[Approved as Amended Minutes of October 18, 2023](#)

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None.

REPORTS:

1. President’s Report – N. Persons

[President’s Report](#)

President Persons stated that they would not read their report but that it would be posted on the Academic Senate (AS) site and asked that all senators read it. President Persons made a statement that included the following points:

- The Academic Senate should be solutions driven in response to the needs of our students and collaborative in our work, gravitating towards a central goal.
- President Persons noted the disturbing nature of recent conversations in meetings that have called into question the expertise of the ASCCC, a nonprofit organization that recognizes the California Code as an authority and is also recognized by faculty, staff, administrators, unions, and senates throughout the 116 District California Community college system as an authority providing expertise on academic and professional matters, including interpretation of the Brown Open meetings Act.
- The AS strives for transparency and focus on 10+1 matters but recognizes that there may be some overlap of issues with the AFA. To this end, ASCCC has developed a survey that will be sent to the other schools in the CCC regarding these issues of overlap. The results of this inquiry will be shared with the AS and the AFA.
- Additionally, President Persons noted that she has been extending invitations to union partners to work together to develop a process for handling issues of overlap between the two faculty groups (AS and AFA).

2. ISSC Report – M. Hale, M. Long

[Integrated Student Success Committee \(ISSC\) Update Report 11.01.2023](#)

M. Hale and M. Long presented on the Integrated Student Success Committee (ISSC) giving a brief history and explanation of the process used by the ISSC. They reported on how deep inquiry and collaborative/cross-functional work is used to design recommendations for interventions on equity gaps identified through data and inquiry. In addition to the report they shared the following PPT: [ISSC PPT](#)

CONSENT: No Consent Items.

ACTION: Items must come from the Discussion agenda of a previous meeting or be carried over from a previous Action agenda.

Peer Online Course Review (POCR).

At the October 4th meeting, the body approved a motion calling for the Academic Senate to establish a 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 (see document below for details). Senators are now asked to consider the following: what recommendations does the body have for the composition of the task force and who shall make the selections.

[Peer Online Course Review \(POCR\) Explained](#)
[POCR Task Force Motion Approved October 4, 2023](#)

President Persons began with points of clarification regarding

- the last meeting's request to go into closed session: President Persons read a statement from SRJC President Garcia that supported the understanding that closed sessions are for personnel and legal issues and must be on the agenda.
- the POCR process: the process ensures that there is a structure in place, within a course, for regular and substantive interaction with students. It does not get back to the instructor but is reported to the college if it is perceived that a course is more of a correspondence course rather than an actual online course. POCR is one of the ways in which a college can help ensure that it is meeting accreditation requirements.

President Persons opened discussion on the action before the AS is to consider the following: what recommendations does the body have for the composition of the task force? And, who shall make the selections of the members of the task force?

- A senator expressed concern regarding clarity and caution about knowing what the issues are and if some of these issues are being negotiated then what is being voted on? The senator suggested waiting to vote while things are being negotiated. In response, a point of clarification was made that what was being voted on was the establishment of a task force and what the task force should look like.
- In further discussion, another senator expressed concern over the limited information on POCR (from previous meetings prior to voting on it), including the required 60 hour training for free. It was clarified that no one is being asked to take the course without compensation and that has not been discussed, yet.
- The senator continued to express concern as to why a task force is being established if SRJC is required to follow the CVC rubric. Lisa Beach (Director, Distance Education) clarified that it is a requirement to have a peer online course review with some prescribed elements, but the specific CVC rubric is not required. L. Beach also noted that SRJC is fortunate to have access to an instructional designer working for us that worked at another college. L. Beach continued by expressing the desire to have faculty input in the process so that there is involvement by the faculty in making decisions about the review process.
- Discussion and questions about what constitutes a "quality course" noted that it includes substantive engagement and meets accessibility guidelines. Another senator noted that the DOC had maintained their own set of best practices and it was a challenge to maintain because they would be out of date. They also suggested looking at the rubric at the very beginning section as it describes what a quality course is.
- Discussions included senators suggesting the 2-4 people (5-7 was mentioned but considered too many to recruit); they should be from a variety of disciplines; and, they should be faculty that teach online. Discussion on how much online teaching

experience a task force member should have brought comments that a variety of experience should be sought and the criteria should not be prescriptive since someone with limited online teaching may have a fresh perspective.

- A senator suggested that the Executive Committee should select the faculty from applicants. It was also suggested that a timeline of a year be considered and that potential study data be collected for review by the Senate, as a body, when the task force is done.
- Discussion continued with questions regarding the purpose of the task force. The purpose of the task force was clarified to be reviewing examples of pilot programs and gathering input and information to develop some recommendations for a pilot program. These recommendations would be brought back and presented to the Senate, as a whole.
- Further discussion about the selection of participants on the task force included selection consideration to include:
 - Training /experience with online courses (recognizing that limited experience is not an eliminating factor)
 - Student perspective
 - Asynch/synch
 - DRD experience

Based on general discussion and input from the Senate body on wording, Senator Avasthi made the following motion about the proposed POCR task force:

I’m Senator Avasthi and I move that 3-4 faculty who have experience in online education and are from multiple disciplines be selected by the ASEC to meet regularly until the end of Spring Semester 2024 with the purposes of establishing a POCR process as drawn from the sample POCR pilot process, and to report back to the Senate on their recommendation for a POCR process.

The motion was seconded and discussion on voting requirements concluded with a reiteration of the motion.

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

The motion to create a POCR Task Force as stated was carried: 23 Yes, 2 No, 1 Abstain

BREAK

DISCUSSION:

1. **Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Student Success: Policy Recommendations** – 20 min.

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?

President Persons opened the discussion with the reminder that the discussion should be within the 10+1 and thinking about student success policies, process recommendations, and academic integrity. The AS wants to be thinking about issues and recommendation about issues like use of AI in instruction, policies and procedures, faculty professional development, etc.

Discussion included

- Clarifying GAI versus AI and possible confusion with AI/academic integrity was noted
- It was noted that some community colleges are developing majors in AI while there needs to be a parallel process to counter AI being used to generate work that folks may be claiming as their own
- A senator reported that constituents have asked them if the AS could recommend a statement on AI to be included in syllabi and if the AS would advocate for professional development on AI. Additionally, they recommended two instructional teaching centers: one for AI curious and one for AI implementers
- It was noted that a lot of other colleges are ahead of SRJC and that as a senate body we do not know enough to even make recommendations: what is out there? And, what do we think about what is out there?
- Discussion ensued about establishing a work group on this very big topic asked how would this be created and compensated since it is such a big topic
- Senator Stover wondered if what SSU is doing could be a model for SRJC and he read part of a message that was sent to all SSU employees by the SSU Provost and VP of Academic Affairs:
"I have been asked what SSU's approach will be to generative AI tools and whether we will ban the use of AI tools on campus. Universities are not banning the use of AI. Rather, they are encouraging safe, analytical, ethical use of these tools. Our approach is first and foremost to preserve academic freedom for faculty to explore these tools while also addressing concerns about academic integrity. Faculty should be aware that tools that purport to detect AI-generated content are not 100% reliable, and unfortunately, all of them deliver high rates of false positives, which could lead to students being accused of academic misconduct incorrectly. We are testing AI detection tools to determine their efficacy as part of a pilot program to evaluate new potential Academic Integrity tools for campus, with the pilot being overseen by the Academic Technology and Instructional Spaces Subcommittee (ATISS). More information on this pilot will be forthcoming from our Center for Teaching and Educational Technology. In the meantime, we are placing teaching, learning, and student success as the highest priorities, and CTET will be hosting a number of workshops on AI in the coming weeks (starting August 24). I encourage faculty and staff, particularly staff in instructional support roles, to attend regardless of your ultimate stance on AI, because knowledge of the tools allows us all to have more control over teaching and learning in our classroom or online learning environments."
- Concerns were expressed about having the District being too heavy-handed when dictating a policy on this since implementation may be more discipline specific
- It was asked if this could be a Professional Development day topic
- It was also suggested that this could be an Academic Senate Retreat topic

Due to time, discussion was stopped and is to be continued at the next meeting with Senators Anderman and Usina to be first in speaking during this topic's discussion.

The following items were not discussed and will be continue to be added to upcoming agendas:

2. Faculty Evaluations

California Education Code Section 87610.1, Section 87663, and Section 87664 identify faculty evaluations as an area of shared purview for academic senates and bargaining agents, and that the bargaining agent has the right to negotiate the specific contract language for the process, but only with the input of the academic senate. 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?

[ASCCC Paper: Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluation](#)

[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 \(includes Self-evaluation\)](#)

Relevant Sections of California Ed Code:

[Section 87663 \(PDF of Section\)](#)

[Section 87664](#)

3. Guided Pathways Update Report

At the meeting of October 18, a senator requested that the Guided Pathways Report be added to the Discussion Agenda for this meeting.

[Guided Pathways Report](#)

INFORMATION

None.

ADJOURNMENT: 5:00 p.m.

ALL FACULTY MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ATTEND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

This Academic Senate is created to secure the professional rights and to carry out the responsibilities of the faculty of the Sonoma County Junior College District. The faculty have the traditional right of college faculty to participate in the governance of the college. As specialists in specific disciplines and as experienced instructors, the participation of the faculty in the governance of the college is essential for the district’s pursuit of its mission.

As professionals, the faculty have the right and a duty to set professional and ethical standards for the conduct of their profession and to promote the excellence of their profession. In order to

achieve these ends and in accordance with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53205, this Academic Senate is established.