



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: August 21st, 2024
TIME: 3:15 p.m.
LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini Senate Chambers Petaluma, 690 Call Bldg.
ZOOM ID: [LINK](#)

PRESENT

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, S. Avasthi, W. Downey, M. Ferguson, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia, T. Johnson, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, L. Dawn Lukas, A. Martin, S. McGregor-Gordon, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, M. Papa, N. Persons, N. Perrone, O. Raola, S. Rosen (remote), E. Schmidt, N. Slovak, I. Tircuit, P. Usina

ABSENT M. Hale (proxy N. Perrone), T. Jacobson (proxy M. Ohkubo), A. Yu

GUESTS Dr. Garcia, A. Forrester, A. Foster, K. Blackwell

CALL TO ORDER

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

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by President Stover.

OPEN FORUM

Nancy Persons, Past President, spoke from personal experience, asking Senators to grant President Stover ease as he takes on his new position.

MINUTES

1. [Draft Minutes of May 1, 2024](#). After no edits were made, Senator Schmidt motioned to approve the draft Minutes of May 1st as presented, seconded. A roll-call vote was called, and the motion

M. Anderman – yes	T. Jacobson (proxy M. Ohkubo) – yes	M. Papa – yes
L. Aspinall – yes	T. Johnson – yes	N. Persons – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes	L. Larsen – abstain	N. Perrone – yes
S. Avasthi – yes	D. Larsen – yes	O. Raola – yes
W. Downey – yes	L. Dawn Lukas – abstain	S. Rosen – abstain
M. Ferguson – yes	A. Martin – abstain	E. Schmidt – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher – abstain	S. McGregor-Gordon – abstain	N. Slovak – abstain
G. Garcia – yes	G. Morre – yes	I. Tircuit – abstain
M. Hale (proxy N. Perrone) – abstain	M. Ohkubo – yes	P. Usina – yes
		A. Yu – absent

passed with 18 yes votes, 9 abstentions, approving the Minutes of May 1st.

President Stover noted sometimes senators abstain if they weren't in attendance at the meeting. A point of order was called by President Stover re: Senator Yu's remote attendance. Without just cause for remote participation it was determined A. Yu would attend the meeting as an observer only, per AB 2449. A senator asked if it were possible to designate a proxy; President Stover clarified not when the meeting has already begun.

2. [Draft Minutes of May 15, 2024](#). After no edits were made, Senator Persons motioned to approve the draft Minutes of May 15th, seconded. A roll-call was made and the motion passed with 20 yes votes, 7 abstentions, and 1 absent, approving the Minutes of May 15th.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
W. Downey – yes
M. Ferguson – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher – abstain
G. Garcia – yes
M. Hale (proxy N. Perrone) – abstain

T. Jacobson (proxy M. Ohkubo) – yes
T. Johnson – yes
L. Larsen – abstain
D. Lemmer – yes
L. Dawn Lukas – yes
A. Martin – abstain
S. McGregor-Gordon – abstain
G. Morre – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes

M. Papa – yes
N. Persons – yes
N. Perrone – yes
O. Raola – yes
S. Rosen – abstain
E. Schmidt – yes
N. Slovak – yes
I. Tircuit – abstain
P. Usina – yes
A. Yu – absent

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

A senator commented they were confused about what the Consent Item is asking; it was pulled and moved to Action.

REPORTS

[President's Report](#) — J. Stover shared the highlights from his report, as well as his intent for meeting conduction. He acknowledged the hard work of the SLO coordinators and thanked their efforts in leading the first district-wide SLO day last Thursday, with a special thanks to coordinators who are also senators, Smita Avasthi and Emily Schmidt.

President Stover acknowledged the public education campaign in support of 10 + 1 purview understanding, in Title 5 Section 53200 B & C. President Stover promised robust faculty collaboration in shared governance with students and administrators; he thanked the present Student Government Assembly (SGA) members for their partnership and participation. He went on to encourage challenges to the Chair and to use point-of-order language to figure out and learn the particulars of Roberts Rules. He noted should ASEC need to sidebar he would ask for a 2–3-minute pause. He closed with a promise to be a good, equitable leader.

CONSENT ITEMS

[Strategic Plan Strategy 1 Goal 1 Objective](#) - Moved to Action for clarification.

ACTION

[Strategic Plan Strategy 1 Goal 1 Objective](#) – President Stover introduced guest Dr. Garcia to answer questions on the topic. He stated the Senate voted to change the language of the objective, which was passed and sent to SRJC's president at the time, Dr. Chong; then Dr. Garcia. She responded to the recommendation of the change to the language, agreeing in spirit and offering the statement in question. He clarified the body can vote to accept this language as it appears in the way Dr. Garcia suggested, or not.

Senators asked Dr. Garcia's reasoning and she explained the need for structure to be as broad and equitable as possible so that there can be conversations to review and discuss annually as a part of the process. Senator Persons made a motion to approve the revised statement of the objective as Dr. Garcia communicated it to us; the motion was seconded. A roll-call vote was called and the motion passed with 26 yes, 1 abstain, 1 absent.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
W. Downey – yes
M. Ferguson – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher – yes
G. Garcia – yes
M. Hale (proxy N. Perrone) – yes

T. Jacobson (proxy M. Ohkubo) – yes
T. Johnson – yes
L. Larsen – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. Dawn Lukas – yes
A. Martin – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes
G. Morre – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes

M. Papa – yes
N. Persons – yes
N. Perrone – yes
O. Raola – yes
S. Rosen – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
N. Slovak – yes
I. Tircuit – abstain
P. Usina – yes
A. Yu – absent

DISCUSSION

1. [New Faculty Orientation Plan](#) & [Draft New Faculty Professional Learning Fall 2024](#)

President Stover welcomed guests Alexa Forrester and Ann Foster (remote) in attendance. A. Forrester provided reflections on the New Faculty Orientation and discussed the plan for the ongoing New Faculty Professional learning program, which will take place once a month for the academic year. The professional coordinators were interested in hearing the body's position about the Associate Faculty orientation piece, after they reported the following from the August 14th New Faculty Orientation:

- Associate faculty were negotiated 2 paid hours for the orientation
- Four of the twenty-four new associate faculty participated in-person.
- Concern for later onboarding of associate faculty resulting in late-notice invitation (some names and emails were not received by the professional development coordinators until the day before the orientation).
- Associate faculty facilitator(s) and/or presenter(s), or orientation sessions with just associate faculty members, would be helpful for new associate faculty to feel comfortable.
- Deciding the date for Spring orientation and providing it for inclusion in the onboarding process would help ensure new faculty are properly notified.

A. Foster then informed the body the first New Faculty Professional learning meet will occur September 13th. The coordinators used the program they developed with Senate guidance last spring to organize fall semester. She shared that the presenters are confirmed; that DRD, B-Care and Student Psychological Service will present together; that the second half of the schedule is focused on Distance Education Canvas accessibility; and a Canvas course shell for new faculty (thanking those Professional Development coordinators before them) is also in the works.

A senator opened the discussion suggesting opening future New Associate Faculty Orientations to all associate faculty, to address this prior deficit. Senators thanked the professional development coordinators for their hard work and asked if there could be a central canvas shell resource for all faculty. The coordinators are unable to upkeep a detailed resource containing different strings of information from different people's updates because there is not enough budget/time for this workload. It was suggested experienced associate faculty from different departments would be good to involve in future associate faculty orientation creation. Senators questioned the efficacy and feasibility of (2 hour) pay for it to be worthwhile for faculty, especially those with physical constraints. They puzzled if a (partial or full) remote orientation would alleviate these constraints. Another associate senator suggested a basic glossary or procedural resource for new faculty, speaking to their own experience with unclear teaching expectations and district requirements. A senator wondered about the creation of an associate interest committee from the senate that pertains to specific associate interests; another senator suggested they work to revive the already-established Senate subcommittee on professional development, and include adequate associate faculty representation and input since this all falls under professional development. Senators with previous Professional Development Committee membership experience

shared that they included a New Associate Faculty Orientation in the New Faculty Orientation as a separate session in the same building and it seemed to work well.

2. [Waitlist Workgroup Proposal](#) & [Waitlist Workgroup Proposal Draft FAQ for Students](#)

N. Persons introduced the topic as the workgroup chair, providing history of the proposal's context. She mentioned the proposal can give actionable enrollment support by creating accurate waitlist data to help SRJC better respond to student needs. With widespread adoption of similar or same waitlist practices across most departments the college's consistency would help students understand the enrollment process.

Beginning with the queue from last meeting last spring, a Senator had a technical question (which they mused may be better posed to Banner technicians in the future) about when classes have restricted enrollment. They mentioned that currently no waitlist of those types of classes can be documented and hoped faculty would be able to build waitlists for restricted enrollment classes within the new system. N. Persons noted that they needed to decide how long after closing the waitlist would they be kept for, since section numbers are reused eventually. Another senator voiced auto-enroll wasn't clear to them, or their students; another reminded the body they cannot assume the current system is working. Senators agreed there isn't an ideal way to show interest in courses currently. They agreed the overall proposal would address the need for this data, as one way to provide insight on student demand (preferred class schedules, instructors, etc.).

A senator asked if the waitlist group investigated the possibility of the waitlists giving false hope to students, with limited class capacity. N. Persons assured the body the workgroup extensively researched this and talked to other similar community colleges who didn't run into that issue. It was observed students were aware of their place and would watch the waitlists regularly. A senator asked if there would be a comment section and N. Persons answered that it's essentially a sign-up sheet, but the Banner system would have interface for messaging. Some senators were concerned about the workload increasing with the faculty maintaining the addition of students. N. Persons reported one other school felt it may be labor intensive after the waitlists closed and other schools said additional labor was negligent. A senator from a department with many restricted courses asked for clarification on question nine on the FAQ document which states add-codes are used beginning on the official first day of classes. The Senator thought that implies instructors cannot give out add-codes prior to the first day of classes so they wanted reassurance that there'd be a way for instructors to give out add-codes a week, or even 3 months, before classes start. Another senator clarified the difference between restricted courses (with certain parameters, i.e. qualifications, safety parameters, audition requirements, etc.) and courses that are open enrolled with waitlists. They specified that the add-code is just the function to get into a restricted course and it could still work and there will be a way in Banner to ensure that different scenarios all work within the proposed, basic system (with exceptions of course). N. Persons promised to ask Banner technicians about the senator's particular nuanced question. N. Persons also mentioned a Community College League of CA staff member working on college manual templates for community colleges' uses wasn't aware of any other college (besides SRJC) in the CA Community College district with a board policy and an administrative procedure re: waitlists.

INFORMATION

[SRJC Local General Education Updates: Title 5, Mandated Alignments, and Areas of Local Decision Making](#)

President Stover introduced the item, which was brought to the attention of the community late last spring, with fall semester to make important decisions. Each meeting this semester will have an aspect of this work (either as action, item, or discussion) to stay on track. President Stover introduced guest K. Blackwell to speak on the item, and congratulated Kate for being Employee of the Month.

K. Blackwell informed people the Title 5 update in Fall 2023 was for aligning Associate Degree for graduation requirements with CAL-GETC changes, which are effective Fall 2025, to take the

place of the CSU transfer pattern. These changes will make one singular transfer pattern for students going to UC or CSU campuses. Initially the state's deadline was Fall 2024, but considering it was released late 2023, it was impossible for many CCs to make those changes happen that quickly. Areas 1-5 are straightforward shifts- courses on local GE pattern for associate degrees will shift to new Areas- with the same titles and requirement criteria. There is discussion about potentially having a (3-6 unit) local SRJC graduation requirement. All decisions have to be made in the Fall so Board policy and procedures can be implemented well before the administrative March 1st deadline (to meet the mandated effective time of Fall 2025). President Stover noted there would be supporting materials related to Area 6 Ethnic Studies, such as recommendations from the Ethnic Studies department and faculty, next meeting on September 4th. He reiterated their decision deadline of December 4th, 2024.

K. Blackwell identified current GE areas not included in the Title 5 updates: in Area F, American Institutions, and Area H, Global Perspectives and Environmental Literacy, and Area I, Information Literacy. She mentioned American Institutions & Global Perspectives and Environmental Literacy both have courses approved locally, so there's no direct loss of GE credit. The local graduation requirements and where certain classes may fit better, if at all, and other recommendations are all in the works from various faculty. California's Academic Senate has a statewide resolution re: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development as a graduation and GE transfer requirement.

A Senator opened the discussion emphasizing the importance of Area E, because without health and wellness there is nothing else. They said classes in art, music, environmental, child development, kinesiology physical component, health, wellness, and nutrition would be gone if they aren't required.

Another senator also remarked how it would be a disaster, on a statewide level to eliminate American Institutions, and to seriously consider it as a local graduation requirement because of its critical part in educating students / voting citizens. A senator asked if the 3-6 units were all in electives. K. Blackwell said the Title 5 changes are made to prevent excessive or unnecessary units; by examining areas in addition to the required six areas (which have a 31 min unit cap) we can pay attention to what we as an institution are desirous of in addition to that minimum. A senator agreed the arts and lifestyle classes are important and if required locally it would enable students without transfer goals to have equitable exposure to those types of courses. One senator asked if the educational elements discussed as valuable (important departments, programs etc.) would be included in the five-year educational plan. President Stover reiterated the discussions and materials brought forward pertaining to the local degree requirement and courses specific to fulfilling the Ethnic Studies requirement are a curriculum issue, which is squarely under Academic Senate 10+ 1 purview. The conversations must be completed and decisions must be made before or by December 4th, 2024.

ADJOURNMENT - 5:00 p.m.