



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

October 2, 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, M. Ferguson, K. Frindell Teuscher, M. Hale, T. Jacobsen (Petaluma), 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 (Petaluma), E. Schmidt, N. Slovak, I. Tircuit, P. Usina, A. Yu (Petaluma)

ABSENT W. Downey (proxy A. Atilgan Relyea), G. Garcia (proxy L. Larsen)

GUESTS None.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

Senator Lukas read the land acknowledgement statement.

OPEN FORUM

A. Forrester, Professional Development Coordinator & Philosophy faculty member:

- was speaking on behalf of self and A. Foster, Professional Development (PD) Coordinator, who were both pleased to see the *reestablishment of the Faculty Professional Development committee* agenda item
- thanked all people on campus previously in Professional Development (PD) work for their creativity and ideas
- based on PD Coordinators' experience: advised it best to create two distinct committees: a multi-constituent group Professional Development Activities (PDA) Day planning committee, that includes 2-3 Senate appointees from the existing **Professional Development Committee**, with the charge to create / organize PDA days. A second senate standing committee on faculty Professional Development, which would include a faculty appointee from each Area to ensure broad representation, would have the charge of bringing high quality professional development opportunities to faculty on pressing matters (such as AI culturally relevant pedagogy, universal design for learning, etc.) on an ongoing manner in ways that are accessible and relevant to disciplines.
 - the Professional Development Coordinators recommend forming two separate committees because they believe the charge and workflow of the two committees are different enough that treating them as a single committee would be overcomplicated and inefficient.

MINUTES

Senator Persons **made a motion to adopt the [Minutes of September 18th](#), seconded.** Hearing no discussion on the motion, **a vote was called and the draft Minutes of September 18th were formally adopted** with 26 yes votes and 2 abstentions:

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

T. Jacobson – 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 – yes
P. Usina – yes
A. Yu – yes

REPORTS

President Stover gave his report, highlighting:

- use of pro-con parliamentary debate structure plan for items' discussion
- Board Policy/Associate Procedure review calls for faculty participation and encouraged faculty to help with the review process
- shared news of collaborative training with Student Services, by ASCCC Past President David Morse and the positive feedback from the community on building public education campaign on 10+1
- the next [Rooted in Love Workshop](#) is 12-2p on October 16th, 2024.
- the kick-off event of the [New Faculty Mentor Program](#) is on October 11th from 2:30-4p.

ACTION

1. Waitlist Workgroup Proposal – Remaining Recommendations

[Waitlist Workgroup Proposal](#)

[Waitlist Draft FAQ for Students](#)

President Stover introduced the item with an explanation of Senate's history on the topic:

- Appeared on agenda from semester's meeting to now: three times discussion and twice action item
- In 2016-2017 waitlist and class sizes appeared on the Senate Annual Goals;
- On November 2nd, 2016, it appeared as a Discussion Item;
- In 2018 there was a waitlist work group which was eventually combined to include class size; later the two topics were split at the request of AFA. Work on waitlist processes and procedures ceased at that time, until last academic year when the Senate formed a work group
- President Stover asked the body if they wished to adopt [Waitlist Workgroup Proposal Recommendation 3a](#).? He clarified the body is voting on whether to confer with EPCC, or not.
- There was procedural confusion amongst senators with the pro-con structure debating whether the body should refer this item to EPCC to come back to us [Academic Senate] with a recommendation.
- A senator asked they discontinue the practice of providing acronyms without explanations (re: [EPCC: Educational Planning Coordination Council](#))
- Point of clarification: if they voted to refer item to EPCC, it would not make the Senate powerless to act on the topic; EPCC is the arm of the senate which does a deeper dive on policy & procedures; EPCC can evaluate the policy change at a level of due diligence that perhaps the body cannot perform.
- There were further points of clarification, at which point President Stover suggested abandoning the Pro/Con mic practice for this meeting due to the confusion.
- Senator Persons **made a motion to refer Question 3a to the Educational Policies Coordinating Council to provide us with their recommendations, seconded.** Hearing no discussion on the motion, the **vote was called and the motion passed unanimously** with 28 yes votes.

- Senator Lukas **made a motion to extend time** for 5 minutes, *seconded*. Hearing no opposition, the discussion continued with the question: **Does the Academic Senate wish to adopt recommendations 2a-2i?**
- Some senators recommended voting in favor, understanding it's something constituents can live with, understanding that it's not fixed in perpetuity but that a regular and predictable district-wide waitlist operation is important.
- Some senators said current waitlist scenario hinders student education and obstructs valid data retrieval on true class demand.
- Reiterated changes in the recommendations can later be made and brought forward by the body, if they find things are not functioning the intended way.
- Senator desirous of discussing with Banner team functionality of auto-add (if they choose that selection)
- Senator spoke re: EMLS non-credit courses, saying 2h. is problematic; consideration of speaking with Banner team to address issue of non-credit courses having the functionality of auto-add
- Senator voiced concern with 2c. asking if a student would take a spot away from others if they're enrolled in a section and still on the waitlist for two other sections of the same class?
- Senator Anderman **made a motion to extend time** by 5 min, and the conversation continued with a clarification: the workgroup proposal does not preclude discussions about revising.
- Senator Lukas **made a motion to accept recommendation 2a-i. on the [Waitlist Workgroup Proposal document](#), *seconded*. Hearing no discussion on the item, the **vote was called and it passed unanimously**.**

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

- The discussion began with encouragement to support this workgroup because the topic of AI is a large, complicated issue that is in dire need of being addressed by SRJC.
- A taskforce is supposed to have a finite period of time, disbanding once either a goal achieved or after specific date set-- that's the difference between standing committee and taskforce.
- Senator Ohkubo motioned that the Academic Senate establish a task force of faculty to develop a set of recommendations for policies and procedures concerning generative artificial intelligence tools before the end of this fall semester, with a report following and the option to extend time for which the task force completes work. *Seconded*. Discussion on the motion? It was asked if the task force could recommend adopting a standing committee? Confirmed this could be a possible outcome, among many other outcomes decided by the task force. A **vote was called and the motion passed unanimously** with 28 yes votes.

3. Consideration of the Faculty Resolution for Senate Action for Generative AI

- President Stover began the discussion with a list of possible actions the body could take.
- Senator Persons **made a motion to refer the resolution on AI to the AI task force for their consideration**, *seconded*.
- A question was asked about the actual resolution and it was clarified that the discussion was based on the motion on the floor: to refer the resolution on AI to the AI task force for their consideration. Senator Persons clarified the motion would be appropriate for the taskforce they just approved, to consider the resolution to propose a plan of action, from the resolution or not.
- It was also clarified that the task force would be made up of broad representation based on [the](#)

[procedures the Academic Senate developed](#) last year for establishing taskforces.

- With no more discussion on the motion, **a vote was called and the motion passed** with 27 yeases and 1 no vote.

M. Anderman – yes

L. Aspinall – yes

A. Atilgan Relyea – yes

S. Avasthi – yes

W. Downey (proxy A. Atilgan

Relyea) – yes

M. Ferguson – yes

K. Frindell Teuscher – yes

G. Garcia (proxy L. Larsen) – yes

M. Hale – yes

T. Jacobson – 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 – no

I. Tircuit – yes

P. Usina – yes

A. Yu – yes

DISCUSSION

1. Local Degree Requirements

President Stover introduced the support documents [in [Area E – Lifelong Learning and Self-Development](#); [Area H – Global Perspectives and Environmental Literacy](#); [Area I – Information Literacy](#); and [Area F – American Institutions](#); also see [CCC Local Degree Supporting Documents for Area E](#); also see [List of Colleges with American Institutions Requirement](#) (non-exhaustive; reflects the colleges that responded to K. Blackwell’s inquiry)] for the question on the table: does the Academic Senate wish to establish local degree requirements in Lifelong Learning and Self-development, Global Perspectives and Environmental Literacy, Information Literacy, and the American Institutions requirement?

- Clarification was sought regarding the information item presentation at the last meeting, made in consultation with faculty members from various areas, providing a Student Success and Wellness requirement—are we combining areas or discussing as they currently stand?
 - We are addressing the areas that have been dropped from Cal-GETC requirements. If the body wishes to include these areas into one area, such as “Student Success and Wellness”, it can do so at a later date.
- American Institutions clarification-- has been a local requirement for 30+ years; doing this would simply maintain that local requirement; would not be new for the student population.
- President Stover pointed out Area F, American Institutions, would be one requirement with Student Success and Wellness being the other requirement.
- Concern for onerous credit requirements was raised-- keeping American Institutions as a local requirement would double count for the Areas that count for Cal-GETC.
- Clarified that the the local requirements would not apply to students seeking an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT).
- Senator Persons **made a motion to move this discussion item to an action item** for the next meeting (and stated when it is moved to an Action Item, the body may discuss what to call the requirements and be clear about what they are recommending to the Board of Trustees). **A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

2. [Guided Pathways Report](#)

- A senator brought up the question of whether it would be possible in the future to map backwards to noncredit; mentioning other community colleges offer noncredit and those classes articulate into credit classes.
- Senator Perrone said he would ask that at the next committee meeting on Monday; he also confirmed the group decided a noncredit student will be included in the student consultation group.

- Concern for when students may need to deviate from the paths; how to ensure exposure to new subjects they may otherwise not have been exposed to?
- Maintaining flexibility for students to explore different opportunities will be possible; pathways are just recommendations; can at any moment move into a different pathway and at the same time there's also GE requirements and other factors; research shows that without 'buckets' presented to narrow the huge umbrella of course options offered based on interests, students will not complete their academic goals.
- Question to the mode which would enable Guided Pathways to help students?
- Clarified that the pathways are options provided by the institution when students are admitted; in the design of these pathways the group would like to know the recommendations from each department discipline experts; the framework has already been made from previous colleague's work. Currently the group is working to finish the mapping and unite constituent groups to hopefully generate a concise website that students can reference.

3. Revitalization of Faculty Professional Development Committee

President Stover declared the phrasing of the item contains a mistake-- the Senate subcommittee is not a subset of the Professional Development Committee. The Professional Development Committee is a senate consultation committee; if they choose to revitalize the Faculty Professional Development Committee, it would be a senate subcommittee, because it squarely pertains to Faculty Professional Development, which is number 8 of the 10+1 charge.

- Senators requested history/context for the topic--
 - It was recalled that shortly after Dr. Chong started at SRJC, professional development moved into Human Resources' (HR) purview and the Senate's faculty professional development committee was disbanded. In previous years people asked the Senate to reconstitute the committee and the topic was brought up at College Council; with the transition of college Presidents and the discrepancies amongst participatory governance operations, the distinction between the two committees was unclear. Dr. Garcia is addressing governance processes and our committee structure, and the college is working on a participatory governance manual, it's a timely conversation.
 - History of HR not consulting with faculty on matters that directly impact faculty, including professional development activities.
- Senator asked for an explanation of the difference between a Senate subcommittee and a consultation committee
 - Professional Development Committee (PDC) primary function is the coordination of PDA days; the professional development coordinators participate as part of the PDC, but they also do work outside of PDC specific to faculty,
 - This senate subcommittee would be focused on faculty's professional development requirements and programs (see Concrete examples of work related to the committee... on support doc)
- Senator Lukas **made a motion to move the item to an action item** for the next meeting. Hearing no discussion on the motion, a **vote was called and the motion passed unanimously**. With time still left on the item and senators in the queue, discussion continued.
- Senator Aspinall reiterated the need for this committee to be populated so that the PD coordinators and Academic Senate Executive Committee are not burdened with the tremendous amount of work required to administer the New Faculty Mentor Program and CoPs.
- Senator Persons stressed the importance of reading Section 4 of Article III of Bylaws because they describe the Professional Development Committee. A revision of the bylaws will need to happen for a

variety of reasons; major issue is it currently states, "the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator(s) will be appointed by the Senate for two years". The District has the right of assignment and because coordinator positions are paid, faculty union partners involvement is important.

- Senator mentioned desire for the body to consider recommending a different way to formulate how to treat associate faculty compensation for professional development, and to clarify how PD works for associates and that it be levied equitably so that the day on which you teach doesn't affect it.
- President Stover made a point of order that working conditions and wages are d within AFA's purview and encouraged them to take up those issues with colleagues in AFA.
- The relationship between the two committees and the collaboration of work was brought into question and President Stover agreed the issues should be sorted out.
- Curious if an AFA representative would serve on the group, or if it would just consist of Senate appointees?
- Senator Persons **made a motion to extend time** of the discussion until the adjournment of the meeting at 5pm, *seconded*. Time was extended.
- Senator Persons pointed out the reason for the current associate faculty involvement on two groups (Faculty Equivalency Committee and District Educational Plan Task Force) was because the Senate made a recommendation to the district to include associate faculty. So, it's not a working condition or compensation issue to say, for example, the Faculty Professional Development subcommittee of the Academic Senate would benefit from associate input, and the body could conceivably make a recommendation to have associate faculty members be included on that subcommittee.
- Point of clarification about the possible courses of action-- multiple motions can be made on a topic, and there are a variety of actions that can be taken (see Questions to Consider in Discussion), which would be good to think about ahead of the next meeting.