



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## **DRAFT Minutes:**

December 6, 2023, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers, Room 4638

Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

## **PRESENT:**

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

## **ABSENT:**

M. Ferguson (proxy = G. Morre), A. Yu (proxy = M. Anderman)

## **GUESTS:**

M. Long, J. Smotherman

## **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 Catherine Williams.

[Full statement is available here.](#)

## **OPEN FORUM:**

### **1. C. Schultz – Topic: Guided Pathways Workplan**

C. Schultz, Math Department, spoke about their reaction to the Guided Pathways Workplan (GP Workplan) and how it made them realize two things:

- 1) Some faculty and administrators are perpetuating math stereotypes and projecting math trauma onto students, leading students to believe that they will not succeed in passing their math courses and should bypass them. C. Schultz suggested that a campus-wide culture should be created to help students believe that they can pass, and will benefit from taking, math courses. C. Schultz also spoke of addressing exam anxiety and creating a system where this can be openly discussed. They spoke of creating an intervention team to help students that failed their first exam and identify/address what went wrong.
- 2) Some people at SRJC might not realize what is being done in the Math Department. C. Schultz explained some of the ways in which they and their colleagues are using real world data to teach math skills and work with students on projects using real world data to explore real word issues (COVID 19, gun control, California wildfires, etc.). Colleagues are also teaching math in relation to personal finances and math's place in history.

C. Schultz stated that they felt the GP Workplan did not capture the efforts of the Math Department and that it should be revised.

[Read C. Schultz full statement here](#)

### **2. G. Morre – Topic: Guided Pathways Workplan**

G. Morre, Math Department, read his statement ([link to statement here](#)). G. Morre first acknowledged that there are numerous recommendations in the Guided Pathways Workplan that could help students but that the report is deficit oriented as it focuses on what the college is lacking rather than what we do

right and building upon that. G. Morre reviewed points in the GP Workplan with comments that included

- the need to actively seek input from faculty and students where they are
- implications in the GP Workplan that faculty are using punitive grading practices seem to indicate that the authors do not have a complete picture of the grading practices at the college as grading practices are used to assess students' understanding of the course topics and to give students feedback

G. Morre expressed concern as to how inaccurate characterizations of our current services will help us find a better way to serve our students. They stated that the problems are complicated and we need a more complete and accurate assessment to solve them.

**3. S. Kessler – Topic: Lack of Discussion of the Conflict and War between Israel and Palestine**

S. Kessler, Biological Sciences, spoke on the lack of discussion about the war in the Middle East. They expressed that this is a painful situation for many and are concerned whether SRJC is a safe place for someone that is Jewish. S. Kessler acknowledged that many colleges in the US are struggling with these discussions and expressed hopes that, going forward, we would have discussions about these issues and the war in the Middle East. ([full statement here](#))

**4. S. Avasthi – Topic: Resolution to Support Trans Students**

S. Avasthi, Library Sciences and Information Resources, introduced a resolution in support of trans students that is being developed in response to concerns raised by trans students and situations facing trans students. S. Avasthi read the draft resolution ([link here](#)) which identifies that SRJC received a score of 2 out of 5 on the Pride index, a national benchmarking tool that identifies 8 factors that can be modified to create a safer environment for LGBTQ students faculty and staff. The resolution provides steps to address some of the issues. S. Avasthi asked everyone to please read and consider the resolution.

**5. S. Jones – Topic: Guided Pathways**

S. Jones, Math Department, expressed that reading the Guided Pathways [Workplan] was disconcerting and that they felt personally attacked ([full statement here](#)). The report does not address the great work that they and their colleagues do in the classroom to help struggling students (such as helping students find resources to address basic needs, mental health and supplemental course support). S. Jones noted that AB1705 is asking students to complete courses for which they are unprepared and that students do not have the same level of math and English skills that they had five years ago. S. Jones provided examples of how students are being assisted and stated that the Guided Pathways [Workplan] should be rewritten to highlight the good things being done and build on that to share throughout the community.

**6. J. Carlin-Goldberg – Topic: Guided Pathways Workplan**

J. Carlin-Goldberg, Math Department, spoke in support of Math Department colleagues' previous Open Forum statements and concerns with the punitive grading comments. They also wanted to highlight colleague and Math Department efforts in the areas of equity and diversity, recognizing that this is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). They also stated that the Math Department is conducting surveys and many of the students are asking for the ability to a pre-transfer level class.

**MINUTES:**

**1. DRAFT Minutes of November 1, 2023**

Senator W. Downey moved to accept the Draft November 1, 2023, meeting minutes without any

additions/corrections. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

**2. DRAFT Minutes of November 15, 2023**

Senator M. Ohkubo moved to accept the Draft November 15, 2023, meeting minutes without any additions/corrections. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

None.

**REPORTS:**

**1. President's Report – N. Persons**

- President's Report
- Survey Email Invitations
- Brief Survey on Senate-Union Consultation Processes

President Persons asked everyone to read the report as there are a lot of details regarding the Academic Senate Union Survey, information recapping Academic Senate work this Fall, the ASCCC Plenary, etc. President Persons briefly highlighted the following items from the report:

- only one response was received for the survey which rendered the survey inconclusive
- President Persons acknowledged and appreciated all of the good work and progress that the Senate has made this semester
- the ASCCC has scholarships for attending the Plenary and one SRJC faculty applied and was awarded---President Persons encouraged others to apply as it is great representation and exposure
- President Persons reviewed some of the Plenary highlighted issues including
  - a resolution for increasing and advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in the evaluation and tenure review process
  - encouraging local academic senates to collaborate with their union partners including working them prior to bargaining to make recommendations regarding revisions to faculty evaluation and tenure review processes to include diversity, equity, inclusion, anti-racism, and accessibility elements and insure compliance
  - urging local senates to develop cultural inclusion and belonging for new faculty through supportive inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, and accessibility centered onboarding and faculty mentoring, and community building.

President Persons ended her report presentation with sharing recent workgroup appointments, acknowledging and thanking the senators that will be going on sabbatical or leaving the Senate after this term, and welcoming faculty that will be joining the Senate next term.

**2. Petaluma Faculty Forum – J. Stover, proxy for M. Martin**

- Petaluma Faculty Forum Report

J. Stover read the Petaluma Faculty Forum Report. The report noted the issues discussed in their retreat and efforts working towards community building and meeting the needs of their students.

## CONSENT:

No consent agenda was scheduled.

## ACTION:

### **Guided Pathways Workplan and District Leadership**– J. Stover, M. Long,

Senators were asked to review the Guided Pathways Workplan. Guided Pathways is an area of mutual agreement between the District and the Academic Senate. Senators were asked to consider whether or not to vote to endorse the plan, or to take no action. Secondly, senators are asked to acknowledge that the superintendent/president's task force successfully completed its task.

- [Introduction to Guided Pathways Workplan](#)
- [Guided Pathways Workplan](#) (see link in discussion points for submitted version)
- [Guided Pathways Discussion/Action at Academic Senate 2022-23 Academic Year](#)
- [Guided Pathways Update Email from Superintendent/President Garcia](#)

After lengthy discussion, no action was taken.

Discussion points included:

- The Guided Pathways Workplan had been revised prior to submission to the Board. The updates included were in response to feedback received prior to the submission deadline: [revised Guided Pathways Workplan submitted to Board link here](#)
- The workplan development had time constraints and a deadline to meet. It has now been submitted to the Board and no additional revisions can be made as it is now at the Board level. At this point, the workplan must be submitted and accepted in order to retain the Guided Pathways funding. Dr. Garcia is committed to implementing Guided Pathways with or without this funding.
- M. Long explained that next steps would include Dr. Garcia calling for faculty for a new Guided Pathways workgroup to make recommendations on priorities, options, and how to implement the workplan. This workgroup will be formed after issues around work needed outside of meetings and compensation are negotiated, etc.
- Many senators expressed concern that the workplan is deficit focused and has a lot of punitive language.
  - It was acknowledged that the framework of the Guided Pathways is a deficit model and that concerns about this deficit focused document being part of history is understandable.
- Many senators expressed concern over the lack of input and lack of inclusion from departments most impacted by this report.
  - Although many of the issues were driven by time constraints, it was acknowledged that one of the many lessons from this process is the need for, and a commitment to, better collaboration and the need to address issues with process, “sunshining”, etc.

- A senator expressed the opinion that wording such as accountability, evaluations, and shared beliefs be removed.
- Senators expressed concern for the barriers that student face and the need for difficult conversations about the barriers.
- A senator that worked on the workplan acknowledged that there are gaps in the workplan; but, also asked senators to recognize the challenges and constraints of this task and that many hours and hard work went into this. They also asked departments to reflect on their participation as it is the same people that participate every time and more people need to step up.
- A senator expressed the hope that we support and have a commitment to students learning math and not just push students through as this affects future access to careers, jobs, etc.

## **BREAK**

### **DISCUSSION (4:15-5:00):**

#### **1. Guided Pathways Report – N. Persons**

The Guided Pathways Report of October 18<sup>th</sup> was brought back, at the request of a senator, for discussion.  
[October Guided Pathways Report](#)

Senators identified constituent concerns that centered around who is in charge of what and included how Guided Pathways and the ISSC were involved in First Year Experience programs, punitive or non-punitive grading – grading as a matter of academic freedom, if 10+1 related items should only be discussed in the Senate, etc.

- M. Long gave a brief history of how this year's FYE program developed and is structured
- N. Persons noted that, while there may be times when certain things should not be discussed, there are faculty on many different committees and we don't want to censor folks
- A senator noted that no 10+1 recommendations are made at the ISSC
- A senator asked that punitive grading (general definition, how do we feel about it, etc.) be discussed at a future meeting

#### **2. Institutional Learning Outcomes Report on Data - J. Smotherman** **ILO Report**

Dr. Smotherman, Senior Director, Institutional Effectiveness, Research, Institutional Research (IERP), gave a brief presentation on SRJC's ILO data. They explained the importance of collecting evidence to show that we are meeting accreditation standards related to continuous improvement through the use of outcome data. Due to limited time left in the meeting, they highlighted several of the data points collected and explained some of the challenges in collecting data and some of the challenges in collecting data and the lack of benchmarks. Dr. Smotherman noted that there was an 11% response rate (2200 students) and they would like to work with the Senate to see improvements on how and what data is collected. Changes to the current ILO data collection and reporting processes would have to be initiated by the Academic Senate.

#### **3. Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives Strategy 1: Academic Quality – N. Persons**

Postponed due to time.

**INFORMATION**

**None.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** 5:00 p.m.

DRAFT