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

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

ABSENT L. Larsen (proxy G. Garcia)

GUESTS A. Forrester, A. Foster, P. Ozbirinci (remote), K. Blackwell

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT
Senator Ohkubo read the land acknowledgement statement.

OPEN FORUM
- A. Foster spoke about the Discussion Item: Resolution on the Ethical Integration of Generative AI (Gen AI) in Education, specifically concerning the meaning of "support" in the third resolved statement. She hoped the Senate's discussion would provide clarification of the intended form of support faculty would receive, since it would affect the Professional Development coordinators purview (she referenced Professional Development Committee's function points 2,3,4, and 7 as well as AFA MOU Special Development coordinator special assignment).
- Senator Aspinall gave an open forum statement announcing the grand opening of the Disability Cultural Center on Petaluma campus. She informed the body the Disability Cultural Center on Santa Rosa's campus will open at the end of the month and encouraged people to get involved with the upcoming events. She also mentioned the Disability Resource Centers are on the third floor of Bertolini in Santa Rosa and in the Call building in Petaluma.
- Senator Rosen gave an open forum statement on the GenAI Resolution: he thanked Dr. Ozbirinci and the Senate's executive committee for putting together a resolution on a timely topic and asked why the District Online Committee (DOC) is selected to develop proposed policies and guidelines. He suggested the inclusion of other SMEs and offered the idea of a committee representing self-identified departments impacted by Large Language Models (LLMs). He also asked why the resolution is focusing on exclusively generative AI writing tools, saying there are general LLMs (such as image generators) that are potentially equally disruptive and important.

President Stover asked the body if there were objections to Senator Yu participating remotely with just cause, related to AB 2449. There were none thus attendance was confirmed.

MINUTES
After there were no edits provided for the draft Minutes of August 21st, Senator Persons motioned to adopt the minutes, seconded. Vote: 28 yeses; adopted unanimously.

REPORTS
Hearing no adjustments to the agenda, President Stover went onto his President's Report. He reminded senators of the Fall Retreat on Friday in the Chambers from 9a-1p. He clarified the rules of engagement on resolutions, informing the body that once something has been agend- ized it no longer belongs to the person(s) who generated it; the Item belongs to the body and discussion should happen in the chambers, not amongst small groups / over email (called "daisy

chain" and "spoke and wheel"). He reminded the body they are accountable to the public and Academic Senate meetings fall under the Brown Act so materials have to be posted 72 hours ahead of meeting. He reported that currently the Executive Committee (ASEC) provides technical support (language and formatting) for forming a resolution, as it reflects 10 + 1 purview, but urged the body to develop clear and transparent ways, equally accessible for all faculty, to access the process of making a resolution. He mentioned the ASCCC Local Senate Handbook outlines a local process for forming a resolution, which the body may consider adopting in the Spring when they consider Bylaws updates and potentially adopting a senator manual. He asked anyone to reach out in the event of missing correspondences due to the demands of his role, closing with the reminder that challenges to the chair are always welcome.

DISCUSSION

1. **Waitlist Workgroup Proposal** – N. Persons, 15 min.
   President Stover introduced Senator Persons to answer questions and asked the body, in the third discussion of this proposal, what they'd like to do with it. Senator Persons reminded the body there are three parts to the proposal: 1. recommendations for immediate implementation (no need to wait for Banner); 2. suggests the Educational Policy Coordinating Council (EPCC) be used as the body to refer the question of whether SRJC should keep waitlist practices as Board Policy & Administrative Procedure as it currently is, or share it elsewhere. 3. a series of recommendations for IT to use as they are making decisions about how to implement the wait list feature in Banner. She asked Banner Senator Anderman's question re: restricted course waitlists but didn't have an answer yet.
   Waitlist Workgroup Proposal
   Waitlist Draft FAQ for Students

   The discussion opened with a Senator wanting the "large whenever possible" recommendation to be "unlimited" / "no-cap" to better capture demand for classes at specific days, times and location. Another Senator asked what the metric of waitlist data would be used for/ why it isn't mentioned in the document. President Stover reminded the body that class size is a negotiated matter in AFA's purview; he said the body could move the item to Action so that in the next meeting they could vote on adopting the proposal or creating a task force, or otherwise contemplating implementation.
   Another Senator supported the large waitlist recommendation and the cancellation of automatic rollover, saying this would lend a predictive quality for most popular scheduled sections for students.

   Senator Aspinall motioned to move the three sections of the Waitlist Workgroup Proposal to an Action Item, seconded. Vote: 28 yeses, passed unanimously.

   A senator asked if there was guidance for the instructors to allocate space if there are openings. Senator Persons clarified the core of the proposal is to stop auto-enrolling students into classes; it identifies 11:55pm, night prior to the first day of class, as the time at which the wait list will close (become inactive). Up until that time students will continue rolling, going from waitlist to being offered the opportunity to officially register for the class. Then, after the official start date, no matter how many students drop out of the class, none will be added unless you choose to add them via, what SRJC faculty calls, an add code.
   A senator wondered if perhaps this would be like in the past, when workgroups have presented recommendations to the senate, the senate provides feedback then the workgroup can change the proposal and bring it back to the body.
   Senator Persons clarified while an item is in Discussion, it cannot be modified, but that in the next meeting senators may consider generalizing the part of the proposal with the extensive list of bullets and may be able to produce three different motions from this proposal.
   Another senator agreed it made sense as an action item because it seemed the desirous changes are few enough that it would be appropriate via action item motioning; they also noted to be aware that the two connected pieces (of auto-enrolling and unlimited or large waitlists) are in separate sections of the proposal.

There was a motion to extend time on the topic, another 8 minutes. President Stover asked if there were those opposed, there was. A vote was called to determine whether to extend the discussion time by 8 minutes; Vote: 20 no's, 6 yeses and 2 abstentions. Motion to extend time failed.

M. Anderman – no	T. Johnson – no	N. Persons – no
L. Aspinall – no	L. Larsen (proxy G. Garcia) – abstain	N. Perrone – no
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes		O. Raola – yes
S. Avasthi – no	D. Lemmer – yes	S. Rosen – no
W. Downey – no	L. Dawn Lukas – no	E. Schmidt – no
M. Ferguson – no	A. Martin – yes	N. Slovak – no
K. Frindell Teuscher – no	S. McGregor-Gordon – no	I. Tircuit – abstain
G. Garcia – no	G. Morre – n	P. Usina – no
M. Hale – no	M. Ohkubo – yes	A. Yu – no
T. Jacobson – no	M. Papa – yes	

2. **Consideration of Faculty Resolution for Senate Action on Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)** – 25 min.

A "[Resolution on the Ethical Integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Education](#)" was introduced by English faculty member Dr. Purnur Ozbirinci. Dr. Ozbirinci collaborated with Laura Nehas on a presentation to the English Department on AI policy and plagiarism; during research on this subject, she grew concerned over her ability to effectively serve students so she joined Laura Nehas and Lisa Beach from Distance Education to craft the resolution, encapsulating their concerns and aspirations regarding the swift rise of AI tools in education. She closed thanking those that offered support and guidance in the crafting of the resolution.

A senator opened by commending the hard work that went into the document, with full support for a lot of it but had concerns with certain parts they thought needed minor tweaking. The final resolve paragraph was mentioned; they were concerned some departments will have a heavier burden than other departments, and concerned about workload issue.

Another senator from the Arts had concern the resolution is not about Generative AI but is particular to essay-writing and ChatGPT, saying they felt the resolution doesn't address the multitude of generative AI tools offered.

A senator asked in 'Whereas number 3' what the asterisk after "students of color" was referring to. President Stover clarified the first reference, and the senator told him he did not see students of color mentioned in the reference, which President Stover noted.

A senator suggested the impact of AI should be phrased within the context of student learning objectives, using achieving the SLO as a global metric for the school.

A senator asked about how this gives a linguistic advantage without triggering academic dishonesty; President Stover clarified that the resolution is not addressing that question, it is focused on the ethical integration of generative AI writing tools.

Past President Persons asked the body to think of suggestions and solutions to bring along with concerns and valid criticisms, so that the body may be action-oriented on this topic. She went on to ask the professional coordinators about the third resolve, "establish a process for faculty to receive support", which calls for the Senate to recommend establishment of a process between the professional development coordinators and the Office of Distance Education. The job description of the coordinators is to coordinate activities as advised by the Academic Senate.

Guest A. Forrester responded that the phrasing of "establishing a process for faculty to receive support" is vague and depending on how it's interpreted by the body, may have workload implications, and may be outside of the Professional Development Coordinator's purview. She explained support could mean establishing a Forever Flex Code about how to ethically incorporate AI, which would be do-able. Or it could mean financial support; if they needed to seek extra money by writing grants, etc. it would present a huge workload burden.

President Stover made a point of clarification on the item's process-- the discussion on the resolution is a small part of a broader conversation that is long overdue and involves many people. The current consideration of the resolution and resulting concerns would go to Academic Affairs leadership, who would, in partnership with the Senate, take anything resulting in training or resources to AFA for negotiations.

A senator asked about the subject matter experts consulted; saying the "in partnership with the Office of Distance Education" piece of the resolved statement may not be representative of all departments. The senator wanted to know the reasoning behind the choice of the DOC. Dr. Ozbirinci explained the District Online Committee members are experts in the field who are faculty appointed by the Academic Senate; so, not wanting to prolong movement on the topic, she refrained from asking the Senate to form a task force. Another Senator mentioned the first resolve statement was an unnecessary ideological test that they didn't believe needed to be included for them to support this resolution on generative AI.

Another Senator asked for the wording in the third 'Whereas' statement to be demonstrative of how AI detection tools are currently unreliable for all students.

Another Senator mentioned they didn't want to exclude the help and expertise from Distance Education and the District Online Committee but thought a Senate taskforce would be a great idea. Coming from a department like Chemistry which doesn't offer distance education, the Senator noted it's important to realize Generative AI is not solely a distance education issue.

A senator shared constituents' perspectives in their discipline, saying certain faculty think the very use of Generative AI in their classes is antithetical to academic integrity. The senator thought it will be difficult to put together something that is going to encapsulate faculty perspective as a whole.

Another senator shared a constituent's feedback that the resolution is dense and trying to address a lot of issues. This senator also fully supported establishing a Senate taskforce and mentioned an example of such a taskforce of Sacramento City College's Academic Senate.

President Stover declared the body was out of time on the subject, and the item would be brought back next week.

3. **Consideration of Senate Taskforce for Area Realignment/Reapportionment** – 15 min.

   President Stover introduced the topic by reading the description -- Article VIII, Section 5 of the Academic Senate Bylaws state "Representation will be reviewed every five years by the Senate for apportionment reconsideration." Does the Academic Senate wish to establish a task force of Senators to develop apportionment reconsideration proposals for the body to review before the end of the current semester? -- and reported that the topic came up in New Senator Orientation, and the Areas have not been updated for over 5 years.

   A Senator thought some senators felt the Areas are disproportionate, and seeing interest on the subject, agreed a Senate taskforce would be a great idea to get the answers from whether or not they should make changes.

   Another Senator said: yes, we should form a task force.

   Another Senator said after New Senator Orientation they realized College Skills and EMLS department are separated by areas; and thought those two things could be together so that faculty representing understand the issues.

   Another Senator agreed a taskforce should be formed and that the Areas 12 and 13 have uneven numbers of associate faculty, but that accurate numbers need to be sought.

   A senator stated, if the body elected to establish a task force, they'd like it to address two questions: why are locations identified, rather than a department or discipline, in Areas (referenced Public Safety Training Center)? And, what exactly is the purpose of representation?

   Another senator wanted to make sure the body was aware of the difficulty in identifying how many people are actually represented by Associate Senators. They stated there is no easy way to identify how many associate faculty currently teach, or have offer rights, but that Payroll or SIS should know this number and there should be an easy way to find this on SRJC's website.

   Senator Schmidt motioned to move the Discussion Item to an Action Item on the next possible agenda, seconded. Vote: 28 yes votes, unanimously passed.

   A senator said things change, priorities shift, departments move, etc. which is why the reapportionment process is an important, albeit complicated, problem to solve.

   A Senator added they'd like the body to consider this question: if an associate senator is not invited to

participate in full-time faculty meetings, how can they represent Associate faculty in the senate? They thought there should be close communication with full-timers of a department and associate faculty senator representatives.

Another Senator stated with the murkiness in the Bylaws re: associate faculty representation, while addressing the Area reapportionment, the body should also consider other sections in the Bylaws to enhance associate faculty input.

President Stover announced the conclusion of the discussion item; it will come back as an Action Item on the next meeting's agenda.

INFORMATION (4:40 – 5:00)

> **SRJC Local General Education Updates** – J. Stover, K. Blackwell, A. Foster, 20 min.
> - Area 6 Ethnic Studies Considerations – Formal Department Recommendations & Cal-GETC Standards Version 1.0

President Stover summarized the Information Item document and recognized Articulation Officer, Kate Blackwell, and Ann Foster as guests for consulting and answering questions.

A senator asked if there could be a broader, data-driven conversation about the total local degree options available at SRJC, because seeing the data for non-transferrable degrees offered may inform those local options. They found SRJC confers, over the past 17 years, a mean of 104 local degrees.

K. Blackwell explained Title 5 has been updated; from that update's Areas, 1-6 are much of what SRJC has for Option A, the local GE AA/AS pattern. Some students who are following those patterns do also follow transfer patterns: CSU or IGETC (soon to be Cal-GETC). In this case, particular to Ethnic Studies Area 6, there is a specific criteria provided in the new implementation (in Cal-GETC Standards Version 1.0 on page 29). The way Title 5 is written provides an opportunity for CC campuses to expand Area 6 beyond the discipline, but those courses would still have to meet the state's strict criteria. She explained she supported SRJC's Ethnic Studies Department's recommendation to stay within the criteria of what CSU and UC partners have articulated because SRJC's Ethnic Studies is a newer discipline and the department is working hard to develop new courses within the discipline pathway. She added that she would also be supportive of the conversation and workings of the Senate if it felt Area 6 could be expanded beyond the discipline since there is a sound existing process that would allow proper course review in determining if courses meet the criteria.

A Senator asked if they chose to expand Area 6, for example, would a course that overlaps with pre-requisites help facilitate the process of moving forward with a program or major faster. They went on to ask if other disciplines were added to Area 6, and students were locally GE certified, would other universities validate those classes that fall outside of Ethnic Studies.

K. Blackwell responded that no, if SRJC's local GE pattern was expanded beyond the discipline the courses would have to be submitted for Cal-GETC review for their Area 6 standards. She reported that over the past 2 years, watching 116 community college campuses submit courses for approval, there have been almost no courses outside the discipline that have been approved (even courses within the Ethnic Studies discipline are being denied), because they aren't meeting the five criteria points.

A senator asked about the potential benefits or drawbacks for considering courses outside of the strict criteria to ease local pattern completion.

K. Blackwell said the department did discuss how that may ease up closed sections for the Ethnic Studies Discipline, but are in the process of approving more courses (which takes time) and in the meantime we have a bit of a dam in the pipeline. If there were more local options the students following a local GE pattern would maybe have more ease in finishing that work.

A senator asked a point of clarification if there were currently any courses at SRJC offered outside of Ethnic studies that count toward the local Ethnic Studies requirement?

K. Blackwell answered that no, they had previously submitted approximately 37 courses, including 8 newly developed Ethnic Studies courses, with the intention to cross-list into Ethnic Studies. Every single course was denied without revision due to state-level GE reviewers' strict criteria. They resubmitted the 8 Ethnic Studies courses and they were approved on the second round of review.

Another Senator asked if there is data to determine whether there are enough instructors and course availability at CA Community Colleges to meet this requirement.

K. Blackwell mentioned she would ask about the reporting functions of the current statewide system Articulation Officers use; she mentioned in Fall of 2021 when Area F for CSU transfer requirement came into play, the state provided leeway to students in that academic year that couldn't finish the Area F requirement in time because the courses were not yet approved.

A senator asked if there were courses in the pipeline for approval for Cal-GETC Area 6; K. Blackwell answered not currently.

A senator asked about their particular course, and if it would be compatible. K. Blackwell answered based on what's happened so far at the state-level, if it's not an Ethnic Studies course, it's probably not going to be approved.

President Stover reminded the body that Ethnic Studies as a discipline has specific criteria as articulated in the Cal-GETC standards, with specific methodologies and proxies that carry out their discipline, so it's not just thematically cross-listing, it's about centering the lives of African American, Asian American, Latinx Americans and Native Americans. President Stover went on to report that History, Political & Social Sciences departments were consulted and would continue to meet with other areas that have requirements that need to be considered as they determine whether to pursue local graduation requirements.

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.