



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

September 18, 2024, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers, Room 4638

Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808 / [link](#)

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

ABSENT W. Downey (proxy A. Atilgan Relyea); M. Ferguson (proxy G. Morre); K. Frindell Teuscher (proxy N. Slovak)

GUESTS J. Smotherman; J. Van Gorp; A. Hanson

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

Senator Ohkubo read the land acknowledgement statement.

OPEN FORUM

1. Senator Atilgan Relyea spoke about an associate faculty related concern for Study Abroad Program:
 - current practice: associate faculty may teach abroad, but required to team up with Contract faculty member
 - Stated this disadvantages student access to associate faculty expertise and advocated for associate faculty to have autonomy
2. Senator Schmidt and Senator McGregor-Gordon invited the community to a virtual discussion from FACCC on October 3rd.
 - Full statement linked [here](#).
3. Senator Johnson spoke as a disability specialist, Academic Senate member of the District Facilities Advisory Committee (DFAC) and as an access ally:
 - At the first DFAC meeting this year, the committee agreed to pursue her request for the District to remove barriers to physical access at SRJC, including resolving the longstanding issue of inaccessibility of the Senate Chamber and other Brown Act meeting locations.

President Stover made a couple points of clarification:

- Petaluma location-- public notified of meeting location change with note posted on Rm 690's door
- Senator Papa with just cause to participate remotely? No objections.

MINUTES

Senator Persons motioned to approve the [September 4th Minutes](#), unanimously passed.

AJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

Senator Aspinall motioned to reorder the Discussion Agenda, discussing Item 2 first and Item 1 second. After hearing the motion seconded, President Stover asked if there were any objections to the discussion item order being reversed and seeing none, it was moved.

REPORTS

1. [Presidents Report](#) – J. Stover

- Planning and Budget Council (PBC) is reviewing ongoing work of the District Education Plan, which is being integrated into District Strategic Planning Action Workgroups. Eventually SRJC will have a coherent strategic plan that reflects a holistic approach to supporting student success from every area of the college, centered on their education. As President Stover works with administrative leads, Jeremy Smotherman, Kate Jolley, faculty appointees, and ASEC members to maintain the integrity of the planning process as it reflects 10+1 purview, he promised to continue to update the body.
- Also in PBC, President Stover is working with District leadership to improve internal policies and procedures specific to grant-writing; there is need to establish faculty consultation on 10+1 matters before, during and after grants are sought, written and implemented.
- In Faculty Staffing Committee, President Stover is working with co-chair Dr. Tam and committee members, to strengthen the equity-related questions on both the quantitative and qualitative forms, for contract and associate faculty.
- President Stover noted Board Policy 3.14 and Procedure 3.14P, which describes a process for reviewing the Academic Calendar, conflicts with current contract language so he will reach out to AFA colleagues and District officials to collaborate on how the Senate can fulfill it's role outlined in the procedure.
- He mentioned the upcoming training with David Morse (ASCCC Past President) on September 26th with Student Services to present college governance training to student services, faculty and staff
- Encouraged people to attend the upcoming Rooted in Love trainings

2. [Accreditation Report](#) – J. Smotherman

- Shared follow-up report is due November 1st
- Shared 13% of all SRJC courses have been analyzed using disaggregated data, the original goal of having a quarter of all courses be completed by Spring 2024
- Thanked all the SLO coordinators
- A senator had a question regarding the data for SLO assessments, even if they were too small to be aggregated in reports.
 - Jeremy clarified the 13% was Department-level, so 13% of all courses assessed in Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.
- A Senator shared the feeling amongst their department was that having multiple-verb SLOs makes it difficult to assess courses; asked if there was potential to have more SLOs that are more specific?
 - Jeremy commented he would support what the Academic Senate chooses
- A Senator asked about how the data is collected
 - Jeremy said the guidelines for data collection came from the Academic Senate originally

3. [Guided Pathways Update](#) – N. Perrone

- District Guided Pathways Workgroup, assembled in the Spring, met in the summer to consolidate short term goals.
- Main focus is developing set of recommendations for the way in which district will implement Guided Pathways
- Workgroup engaged the support of Byron Reaves and Michelle Simotas from Career Ladders to bring recommendations to the workgroup based on what other institutions have done with Guided Pathways, what worked and what hasn't.
- Ensure SRJC's approach to Guided Pathways is tailored to SRJC specifically, and the workgroup is working on emphasizing a local, distinct approach which aligns with SRJC culture and student populations.
- They are also considering how the work of Guided Pathways will work in concert with the District Strategic Plan to ensure a sustainable project serving students first and foremost.
- In the short time the workgroup met, they put forth two key recommendations-- 1, Commencing Program Mapping (something that some colleges are doing and is an essential first step; idea is that,

with discipline experts, put together a map of courses they recommend in order to obtain the degree in that discipline) and 2-- Create a Student Advisory committee to make sure Guided Pathways is addressing issues students currently face with their involvement and input at every level.

- A senator asked about the existing work that went into Guided Pathways already over the years
 - All workgroup recommendations are being utilized and most of the groundwork has been laid, the current workgroup is receptive and embracing the work that's already been done
- A senator asked about the state approval
 - Once the recommendations are implemented there will be associated reviews, to maintain some ongoing funding
- A senator asked about the program mapping software and its capability for support courses
 - Banner implementation and registration concerns will be brought back to the workgroup

ACTION

1. [Waitlist Workgroup Proposal](#)

(referenced in discussion: [Waitlist Draft FAQ for Students](#))

- Senator Persons clarified any waitlist practices can be applied at the section level
- She has not received word from Banner yet re: the specific restricted course scenario
- Senator Garcia motioned to adopt the Recommendations to apply now (Pre-Banner implementation) 1a. & 1b., seconded.
 - Discussion on motion: Senator Johnson motioned to amend the language in Area 1 to: *Allow faculty of restricted classes to build non-student-facing wait lists without close dates.* The motion was seconded, and President Stover identified the friendly amendment to the motion, asking if there was any discussion.
 - Senators asked for clarification re: the amendment's viability
 - A Senator clarified the first two recommendations are identified as things that we can address now in the current system (with the caveat that IT capabilities don't occur overnight)
 - The amendment to the motion was retracted.
- After no one objected to Senator Johnson withdrawing the friendly amendment, the vote on the motion to adopt the Recommendations to apply now (Pre-Banner implementation) 1a. & 1.b was called. Motion passed unanimously.

2. **Consideration of Senate Taskforce for Area Realignment/Reapportionment**

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 Fall 2024 semester?

- Senator Lukas motioned that yes, based on the discussion and interest in the previous meeting, the Academic Senate should establish a task force, seconded. A clarification was asked if the guidelines for task force had to be said in the motion, President Stover clarified that the process is already established. Hearing no further discussion, a vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION

1. **Consideration of Senate Taskforce on Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)**

Does the Academic Senate wish to establish a task force of faculty to develop a set of recommendations for policies and procedures concerning Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools (writ large) before the end of the Fall 2024 semester?

- A Senator answered that yes, the discussion last meeting showed the issues are much too complex to address under the resolution they were presented with, and the first step would be to establish a task

force to address this.

- A point of clarification was made that the only motion that can be made on a Discussion item is for it to be moved to an Action item.
- Senators discussed the idea and asked about the nuances of AI and it was clarified that when task forces are created, ideally broad representation from multiple disciplines are sought.
- A senator mentioned because the issue is so overarching and not going away anytime soon, establishing a temporary task force may not be the best route, as other institutions have created AI steering committees to address the topic as it evolves.
- A senator voiced support for the task force, hoping it would explore the long-term implications and that their recommendations could be varied (examples: identify an existing committee that takes it on as their charge, establish a new committee that takes it on as their charge, etc.). They went on to explain the purpose of a task force is to flush out all possibilities and make recommendations for the Senate to then discuss.
- A point of clarification was asked; it was clarified a task force makes recommendations that they bring forward to the Senate body; a task force doesn't make decisions in and of itself.
- A senator reiterated the need for a taskforce to come together to investigate and explore all that they don't know on this very important topic.
- Senator Ohkubo motioned to move the Senate Task Force Consideration on Generative AI to Action. A vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously and will appear as an Action Item.

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

A “Resolution on the Ethical Integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Education” has been brought forward by English Faculty Member Dr. Purnur Ozbirinci. The resolution under consideration presents three Discussion Topics (Resolutions 2, 3, & 4) for the Academic Senate to take up if we so choose. Does the Academic Senate wish to consider this resolution for adoption?

- A senator commented the resolution is well-intentioned and recommended it go to a (future) task force since there is more information needed
- Senators agreed careful consideration of all Artificial Intelligence tools and their applications; and due to the complexity of the issue would want to refer it to a task force.
- President Stover reminded the body that the only motion that can be made on a discussion item is having it moved to action.
- Senator Schmidt motioned to send the Resolution on AI to the Action Item agenda, and a discussion on the motion followed--
- If the motion to move the resolution discussion item to an action item was voted down, the discussion would be over. A senator clarified if it passed, there would be opportunity for discussion and potential action (such as deferring discussion on the item to taskforce). Senators agreed moving it to action would allow for suggestions and future discussion, with all things (recommendations, amendments, voting down, etc.) being possible.
- A call for the question was made and a vote was made on the motion to move the Resolution on AI to Action item for next meeting's agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION (4:40 – 5:00)

SRJC Local General Education Updates – T. Jacobson, J. Van Gorp; A. Hanson

- [Area E - Lifelong Learning and Self-Development](#) (also see [CCC Local Degree Supporting Documents for Area E](#))

- o Includes Area H - Global Perspectives and Environmental Literacy

- o Includes Area I - Information Literacy
- [Area F - American Institutions](#) (links to separate slide deck)

SRJC Local General Education Updates: Title 5, Mandated Alignments, and Areas of Local Decision Making

Senator Jacobson, on behalf of Senator Ohkubo and several other faculty, presented the Area E Title 5 changes.

- When Cal-GETC was formed the CSU and UC transfer patterns merged; the CSU track had Area E, which is called Lifelong Learning and Self-Development. With the merging, the Area was eliminated and there were several resolutions that came forward in the Academic Senate at the state level
- Several disciplines at SRJC are within Area E
- Faculty decided the title of Area E should change from Lifelong Learning and Self-Development to: Student Success and Wellness
- Noted LIR 10 course could apply to this area as well

- Faculty members J. Van Gorp and A. Hanson announced their position to maintain the local American Institutions requirement
- For a well-informed citizenry SRJC's Mission and Vision speak directly to the American Institutions requirement, so removing them would undermine our mission.
- They hope that the body see that it's important to codify this, saying if we want students to continue to learn history and their rights to empower them, to make tangible, positive change to remove oppressive structures and help students identify disinformation, especially when it comes to election integrity
- A. Hanson provided a quote from a student from this past spring semester: *"Thank you for doing what other people couldn't for 13 years and inspiring me to actually care about politics."* After learning about the structure and processes of democratic institutions, the student decided they wanted to become more civically engaged and they voted for the first time in the past presidential primary.
- Mentioned the state Academic Senate has already passed resolutions urging districts to create room for local bodies to educate people on democratic values and principles

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.