



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers,  
Room 4638

Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808 / Click [here](#) to start Zoom

**PRESENT** M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Avasthi, J. Davis, W. Downey, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia, T. Jacobson (Petaluma), J. Kremer, L. Larsen (remote), D. Lemmer, L. D. Lukas, A. Martin, S. McGregor-Gordon, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, M. Papa, N. Perrone, N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), T. Ruiz, E. Schmidt, J. Stover, I. Tircuit, P. Usina, A. Yu

**ABSENT** T. Johnson (proxy L. Aspinall), N. Slovak

**GUESTS** R. Eurgubian, A. Sanchez-Carreno, J. Flores, R. Smith, B. Davis

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order by President Stover at 3:15 p.m.

**LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT** Land acknowledgement statement was read by Senator Avasthi.

### **OPEN FORUM**

S. Whyly: Congratulated the Senate GenAI Task Force for their work on their recommendations document. Agreed with the bulk of the recommendations and the spirit of the document which empowers faculty to make decisions in their own courses as to what, if any use, of GenAI is appropriate. Requested clarification, in the case of the availability of appropriate software and application tools, that the District has a responsibility to ensure that such tools are provided to faculty and appropriate training for such tools is also provided.

### **JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION**

President Stover asked the body if there were concerns for Senator Larsen participating remotely due to just cause. No concerns were raised and participation was approved.

**MINUTES** Correction/Adoption.

#### [Minutes of January 15<sup>th</sup> 2025](#)

President Stover explained the correction already sent-in from a Senator (page 4, third bullet point of Discussion Item 2: Senate Area Reapportionment): ‘Maintaining six associate ~~senators~~, *senators*.’ President Stover asked the body if there were any other corrections. Hearing none, Senator Persons motioned to adopt the Minutes of January 15<sup>th</sup> as corrected, seconded. Vote passed, with 22 Yes votes, 5 abstentions, and 1 absent.

*[vote record continued on next page]*

M. Anderman – yes  
L. Aspinall – yes  
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes  
S. Avasthi – yes  
J. Davis – yes  
W. Downey – yes  
K. Frindell Teuscher – abstain  
G. Garcia – yes  
T. Jacobson – yes  
T. Johnson (proxy L. Aspinall) – yes

J. Kremer – abstain  
L. Larsen – yes  
D. Lemmer – yes  
L. D. Lukas – yes  
A. Martin – yes  
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes  
G. Morre – yes  
M. Ohkubo – yes  
M. Papa – abstain  
N. Perrone – yes

N. Persons – abstain  
S. Rosen – yes  
T. Ruiz – abstain  
E. Schmidt – yes  
I. Tircuit – yes  
P. Usina – yes  
A. Yu – yes

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA** Any senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion. No adjustments to the agenda were made.

## REPORTS

### [President's Report & President's Addendum 2.5.2025](#)

President Stover addressed proposed updates the Faculty Hiring Policy procedure by the District:

- President Stover and Senate Vice President (VP) Ohkubo met with Dr. Garcia and Zehra Sonkaynar to review the District's feedback.
- Dr. Garcia emailed an informal response to Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC), proposing a revised AP with her explanations
- President Stover clarified the Senate's role moving forward: to ensure faculty input to Faculty Hiring Procedures as defined by Ed Code. He clarified he does not want to revert to past practices that disproportionately impacted Senate timelines. ASEC will continue to address concerns in collaboration with Dr. Garcia and Zehra, and will bring forward an updated and revised AP 7210 to the body, marked as an urgent Discussion Item, asking if the Senate endorses the AP.

President Stover also updated the body on the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA)'s response to the [Waitlist Recommendations](#) made by the Senate:

- Recommendations 1a. & 1b. are being implemented into Banner system currently
- The remaining recommendations (2a. – 2i.) will be implemented in the timeline Banner project managers / coordinators will provide

**CONSENT** Treated collectively as one Action item. Any senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion.

None.

**ACTION** Items must come from the Discussion agenda of a previous meeting or be carried over from a previous Action agenda.

1. [Establishing Long Term Practice for Student Learning Outcomes \(SLOs\)](#) – *Does the Senate wish to adopt the recommendations for establishing an Outcomes and Assessment Committee charged with coordinating the assessments of Institutional, Service Area, Program, General Education, and Course SLOs as described in the SLO Coordinators' Recommendation to the Academic Senate?*

Senator Lukas made a motion to adopt the recommendation of the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) coordinators to create the committee as outlined in their proposal, seconded. President Stover asked if there was debate on the motion, hearing none the vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

2. [Senate Generative AI Taskforce Report and Recommendations](#) – *What is the Senate’s recommendation(s) for Generative AI policies and procedures as based on the recommendations from the Fall 2024 Senate Generative AI Taskforce?*

[Additional Support Document: Library Faculty Feedback for the Senate AI Taskforce Recommendations \(Fall 2024\)](#)

- President Stover introduced the Taskforce Report document, clarifying pieces could be acted upon.
- Senator Martin clarified the primary recommendation was the idea that some type of group on Generative AI would be formed.
- Constituents opinions were shared by senators: asking for an institutional policy along with instructor autonomy; intersection of Generative AI and the increase in online course scheduling; addressing environmental impact of AI and SRJC’s sustainability mission; etc.
- Senator Perrone wondered if the second recommendation, Institutional Policies and Instructor Autonomy, should be forwarded to College Council and if the fourth recommendation should be forwarded to department chairs. There was discussion and clarification sought re: the forwarding of recommendations.
- Senator Ohkubo motioned to extend time by 10 minutes. Hearing no objections, time was extended.
- Senator Perrone moved to adopt and forward #2 and 4 Recommendations to the appropriate bodies, seconded.
- Senator Usina asked for a point of clarification about Recommendation # 2; it was clarified the Library Feedback re: language used was not included in the original recommendation.
- Senator Usina moved to amend the motion on the table, using opt-out language suggested in the Librarian feedback, seconded.

There was further discussion clarifying specifics of the amendment to the motion as the Library Feedback document was displayed.

- Disagreement about the onus of AI policy being on students (as well as tutors, writing centers, etc.) versus instructors was the crux of the friendly amendment on the motion – a vote was called on the amendment to the motion and the amendment failed, with 16 no votes, 8 yes votes, 3 abstentions, and 1 absent.

M. Anderman – no  
 L. Aspinall – no  
 A. Atilgan Relyea – no  
 S. Avasthi – yes  
 J. Davis – abstain  
 W. Downey – no  
 K. Frindell Teuscher – no  
 G. Garcia – no  
 T. Jacobson – yes  
 T. Johnson (proxy L. Aspinall) – abstain

J. Kremer – no  
 L. Larsen – no  
 D. Lemmer – no  
 L. D. Lukas – no  
 A. Martin – no  
 S. McGregor-Gordon – yes  
 G. Morre – no  
 M. Ohkubo – abstain  
 M. Papa – no  
 N. Perrone – no

N. Persons – yes  
 S. Rosen – yes  
 T. Ruiz – yes  
 E. Schmidt – no  
 I. Tircuit – no  
 P. Usina – yes  
 A. Yu – yes

Discussion on the motion on the table followed:

- In the Resolved statement, “The SRJC Academic Senate affirms the decision to accept or reject the integration of Generative AI tools within a classroom setting remains at the discretion of individual instructors”, a Senator suggested adding institutional and departmental roles.
- Another Senator reasoned they were not in favor of the motion due to more discussion needed on the topic; suggested looking at SRJC’s Academic Integrity policy to begin; clarified departments have practices but not policies; faculty within a department may have different needs.
  - Another Senator encouraged action and called for the vote. The motion to adopt and forward Recommendations #2 & 4, from the Senate Generative AI Taskforce Report and

Recommendations, to the appropriate bodies failed, with 16 no votes, 8 yes votes, 3 abstentions, and 1 absent.

M. Anderman – yes

L. Aspinall – no

A. Atilgan Relyea – no

S. Avasthi – no

J. Davis – no

W. Downey – no

K. Frindell Teuscher – no

G. Garcia – abstain

T. Jacobson – no

T. Johnson (proxy L. Aspinall) – no

J. Kremer – no

L. Larsen – no

D. Lemmer – yes

L. D. Lukas – yes

A. Martin – abstain

S. McGregor-Gordon – abstain

G. Morre – no

M. Ohkubo – no

M. Papa – yes

N. Perrone – yes

N. Persons – no

S. Rosen – yes

T. Ruiz – yes

E. Schmidt – no

I. Tircuit – no

P. Usina – no

A. Yu – yes

### **BREAK – 5 minutes**

Following the break, in the interest of time, President Stover asked if there were any objections to moving Discussion to follow the Information, because of the guests present. No objections were made and the agenda was adjusted.

President Stover went on to introduce the final Action Item and updated support document:

3. [Exemptions to Local AA Patterns \[SRJC GE Pattern Item\]](#) – *Does the Academic Senate wish to adopt two new exemptions to local degree requirements specific to students in high unit majors and/or those having completed six months or more of active military service?*

[Title5 Aligned Local GE Pattern and Possible Exemptions YouTube Explainer Pattern Example](#)

[Updated Support Document: Final Title 5 Alignment of the SRJC Local General Education Pattern](#)

- A senator voiced support for the exemption to high-unit majors to allow students more room for self-exploration or building their resume.
- Another Senator clarified it would affect a very small number of students and it wouldn't be appropriate to ask a discipline with intense requirements to consider having fewer units.
- Other Senators voiced strong support for the two Areas of the exemptions (American Institutions & Student Success and Wellness); not allowing the exemptions is a value-stance.
- Other comments followed about student's intentions for transferring (AA/AS degree not being sought-after) and other community colleges having more units in their high-unit programs/majors (example: radiology technician).
- Senator Lukas made a motion to reject the new exemptions to Local Degree Requirements, seconded. President Stover clarified if Senators vote 'no' it means they do not wish to reject the new exemptions. If Senators want the exemptions to be rejected, vote 'yes'.
- The vote was called and the motion to reject the new exemptions to Local AA Patterns passed, with 19 yes votes, 7 no votes, 1 abstention, and 1 absent. President Stover clarified the exemptions will *not* be enacted.

*[vote record continued on next page]*

M. Anderman – no  
L. Aspinall – yes  
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes  
S. Avasthi – yes  
J. Davis – yes  
W. Downey – abstain  
K. Frindell Teuscher – yes  
G. Garcia – no  
T. Jacobson – yes  
T. Johnson (proxy L. Aspinall) – yes

J. Kremer – yes  
L. Larsen – no  
D. Lemmer – yes  
L. D. Lukas – yes  
A. Martin – yes  
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes  
G. Morre – yes  
M. Ohkubo – yes  
M. Papa – yes  
N. Perrone – yes

N. Persons – no  
S. Rosen – yes  
T. Ruiz – no  
E. Schmidt – yes  
I. Tircuit – yes  
P. Usina – no  
A. Yu – no

## INFORMATION

1. [AB928/ADT Video Project \(Robin Eurgubian, Alma Sanchez Carreno, Julio Flores\)](#) – *Based on a limited duration grant funded special assignments, faculty have the opportunity to contribute to this project and submit their interest thru February 21<sup>st</sup> as follows (32 mini interviews/videos):*

*There will be an open call process for departmental faculty in the respective ADT disciplines to express interest in participating in the AB928 ADT Major Exploration Videos. Applicants will submit a brief letter of interest, not to exceed two pages, that addresses the applicant's interest and experience regarding their respective ADT program, by February 21, 2025 [to the VPAA](#).*

- Counselor Robin Eurgubian, Counselor (focus is Transferring), joined by Dean of Counseling, Julio Flores, introduced the Assembly Bill (AB) 928 focusing solely on streamlining Associate Degree for Transfer (ADTs)
  - A [video example](#) from Rio Hondo College was shown to the body; they asked for faculty to spread the word on this project with a deadline for proposals of February 21<sup>st</sup>. Details were clarified:
    - Production begins first week of March.
    - Open call process for departmental faculty in the respective ADT disciplines: submit letters of interest by February 21<sup>st</sup> 2025 to VPAA and selected by VPAA Dr. Holcomb.
    - Faculty would be responsible for: 15 minute interview, identifying ideas for B-roll footage, and identifying students. Compensated for their time up to 1.5 hours.
  - Contact information:
    - Julio Flores: [jflores2@santarosa.edu](mailto:jflores2@santarosa.edu)
    - Robin Eurgubian: [reurgubian@santarosa.edu](mailto:reurgubian@santarosa.edu)
    - Alma Sanchez-Carreno: [asanchez@santarosa.edu](mailto:asanchez@santarosa.edu)
  - A Senator asked if there is a consideration for students that are transferring but not getting an associate degree; it was clarified for now it is just ADT but has broader impact.
  - Another senator asked if their department, soon to have an ADT, is eligible. It was clarified the funding for 32 ADTs included pending ADTs.
2. **Career Education and Professional Development Opportunities – R. Smith & B. Davis**
    - Brad Davis, Dean of Workforce Development, and Rachel Smith, Director of Career Education (CE) Grants and Workforce Programs, met with President Stover to partner with Academic Senate about professional development opportunities: [PowerPoint Presentation linked here](#).
    - The presentation highlighted two sources of grant-funding, federal and state:
      - Federal = Perkins; allocated for one year period with core indicators being enrollment, completion, non-traditional enrollment; employment
      - State = Strong Workforce Program; allocated for two-year periods, with More & Better metrics used (increasing enrollment and improving program quality)

- CE Mini-grants information can be found on their website: <https://ce.santarosa.edu/grants>
- Typical process involves faculty finding an opportunity, submitting an application, and including supervising administrator's support and verification of training-relevance to CE teaching assignments
- Professional development opportunities are open for any faculty member to attend but the funding that career education has would be solely for CE faculty
- Discussed how [Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment \(CLNA\)](#) identifies 5 gaps in professional development, which are supposed to guide investment into projects and efforts in the next few years to reduce those gaps
  - Based on senator questions it was clarified the funding is only for Career Education (CE) faculty but CE grants can be braided with other funding opportunities and the professional development opportunities can benefit non-CE faculty and thus should be shared to all faculty.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

President Stover adjourned the meeting at 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.