



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

February 19th, 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, S. Avasthi, J. Davis, W. Downey, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia (remote), T. Jacobson (Petaluma), T. Johnson, J. Kremer, L. Larsen, 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, N. Slovak, J. Stover, I. Tircuit, P. Usina, A. Yu (Petaluma)

ABSENT A. Atilgan Relyea (proxy M. Ohkubo)

GUESTS R. Garcia

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 Kremer.

OPEN FORUM

M. Ohkubo: Made a statement, speaking against institutional racism and for the brown families from the most under-served area of Santa Rosa, in opposition to the closure of Elsie Allen High School, explaining the Board did not follow legal process. She urged others to join her at the Santa Rosa City School Board’s special meeting February 21 at 3pm, where the Board is slated to come to a decision about closing Elsie Allen High School. She announced improper methods were used and an equity impact analysis was not conducted as required by [CA Ed Code 41329](#).

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION

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

MINUTES Correction/Adoption.

[Minutes of February 5th, 2025](#)

President Stover asked if there were any edits to the Minutes of February 5th, 2025. Hearing none, Senator Persons moved to approve the Minutes of February 5th, seconded. The minutes of February 5th, 2025, were adopted after the vote: 26 yes, 2 abstain.

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

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 – yes
N. Perrone – yes

N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
T. Ruiz – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
N. Slovak – abstain
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

1. **President's Report:** President Stover opened his report focusing on the Action Item on Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI), providing four meta-themes as potential actions to consider in advancement of the task force and/or library's recommendations. He reminded the body they had thirty minutes dedicated to the topic. President Stover next introduced the topic of Area Reapportionment, thanking Senator Morre and Senator McGregor-Gordon for their work in providing the [taskforce recommendations](#). He noted the discrepancies in numbers and suggested the focus to be on the disproportionate amount of Area 12 versus Area 13 constituents. He also reminded the body the current Senate workgroup on Bylaws and Constitution that could take on some of the work. He closed by thanking the collaborative work of AFA colleagues K. Frindell Teuscher and AFA President Anne Donegan; and ASEC team, especially the preparation done by VP Ohkubo and Secretary Aspinall.
2. **Guided Pathways Report:** Senator Perrone updated the body on Guided Pathways progress: the workgroup, with two faculty coordinators, Michael Hale and Filomena Avila, is in the implementation stage; new branding, implementing Senate feedback; mapping is the major focus of Spring 2025, which is complicated by the software integration and SRJC's transition between SIS systems; still working with SGA and other student groups to make sure the students have a sustainable voice in the implementation; many things need to be addressed within current program mapping and integration before it's rolled out on the student-facing side, in an effort to do it right through accurate sequencing. In closing, Senator Perrone will bring senators questions back to the workgroup: mapping prerequisites in career/technical programs; consideration of high school student's semester schedules and dual enrollment; what can be done, through working with other groups like the Senate, to address Scheduling policy/procedures.

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. [Senate Generative Artificial Intelligence \(GenAI\) Taskforce Report and Recommendations](#)

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

[ASEC's Gen AI Crosswalk document](#)

Senator Lukas opened by reading constituent's opinions re: Gen AI's harm to creative and critical thinking, problem solving, reading/writing skills, and ability to face challenges; and to those originators of intellectual property which AI businesses co-opted without acknowledgement or payment. Senator Lukas moved to forward the three resolves from the resolution included with the [task force recommendations](#). Discussion on the motion involved agreement on action but concerns re: the inadequacy of the motion to address the themes the Senate executive team deliberately laid out. Some senators felt that the statements in the resolves weren't fully thought-out (example: 'etc.' used in the academic dishonesty statement) which could lead to inadvertent danger to students from a misunderstanding; other senators supported the motion as a good starting point and felt the academic freedom of instructors was an important factor.

Due to the discussion, Senator Lukas wondered if she could amend her motion.

A point of order re: Robert’s Rules was made, clarifying that the maker of the motion can ask for unanimous consent of the body to withdraw their motion.

Senator Tircuit called for the vote, and it was taken. The motion on the table failed. Vote: 15 no, 13 yes.

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

President Stover reminded the body that the broader recommendations provided by Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) in the Agenda under the Action Item (and within the Presidents Report) were made to organize and guide the body through the discussion. A Senator mentioned the body could take recommendations to the Educational Planning and Coordinating Council (EPCC) to revise the policy to address the use or misuse of Gen AI. A senator commented on the work group’s recommendations as a good starting point and wanted to recognize the coherent work done by those colleagues, as well as ASEC, and wanted to move forward those broader actions.

Senator Persons moved that the body refer the original Gen AI workgroup’s recommendation document, the Library Department response document, ASEC’s crosswalk document, as well as all Senate Meeting Minutes where AI is on the agenda, to EPCC and specifically request that they bring back to us this semester a suggested modification of our current academic integrity policy, as well as other policy and procedure that should be reviewed as a result of these conversations, seconded. With questions re: the motion President Stover asked for a pause, and for the body to take the break, while the Motion is developed to display written on the screen.

BREAK – 5 minutes

President Stover announced there was a motion on the screen:

I am Senator Persons and I move that we refer all Generative AI documents agendized and discussed by this body to the Educational Planning and Coordinating Council, and that we request they use these materials to propose an update to the current Academic Integrity policy and procedure, and that they identify any other policies and procedures impacted by these documented discussions by the end of the spring semester [seconded].

Time ran out for the item. Senator Persons made a motion to extend time by 3 minutes, seconded. Without any opposition, time was extended by 3 minutes.

Discussion on the motion continued. It was clarified that policy and procedure is the responsibility of College Council. Suggested language from the Senate could go to either EPCC or College Council, come back to the Senate for final approval, and then go to the Board. It isn’t likely that implementation of this board policy and associated procedures could occur before the end of this spring semester.

President Stover announced there was no more time left for the item. Senator Ohkubo moved to extend the time by 2 minutes, seconded. With no opposition, time was extended. A call for the question was made and

the vote was taken: 24 yes votes, 4 no votes. President Stover announced the motion passed and that the Item would come back on the next meeting's agenda.

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

DISCUSSION

1. [Senate Area Reapportionment: Taskforce Report and Recommendations](#) – *What is the Senate's recommendation for Senate Area Reapportionment as based on the recommendations from the Fall 2024 Senate Reapportionment Taskforce? (see link above)*

A senator began the discussion with a remark that contract faculty shouldn't only be representing the full-time faculty in their areas, with associate representation elsewhere. The senator felt this creates a communication issue and wants reapportionment to address this disparity.

Other senators would like one Associate faculty member and one Contract faculty member representative for each area, depending on constraints of Bylaws or other rules.

A senator, referencing [Senate Bylaws Article 8, Section 1](#), said this implies Areas 1-11 are for Contract faculty. Section 4 definitions of Areas 12 & 13 are Associate but refer to the contract Areas 1-11 in their definitions, which they clarified could be an internal contradiction between current Senate Bylaws and Constitution.

Another senator clarified changing the Bylaws would be allowable and easier than making changes to the Constitution and suggested continuing to have two Contract faculty for each area, with the inclusion of all faculty in those areas (Contract *and* Associate), and then also continue to have six Associate faculty representatives at the table.

Discussion continued about the data gathered and the different methods for determining numbers of faculty that are currently employed with offer rights, and the concern that data from Payroll and HR departments fluctuate and differ from one another.

President Stover closed the discussion on the Item by announcing it would be brought back at the following meeting.

2. **Shall the Academic Senate fund up to three additional faculty to attend Spring 2024 Plenary with President Stover this March?** – This is an item related to our Spring Retreat Discussion Topic *“How shall we engage in establishing priorities and management specific to our fiscal management?”* and one that requires immediate consideration if we are to use Senate funds to send up to three additional faculty to Spring Plenary with President Stover.

Relevant links:

[Spring 2025 Plenary Registration Information](#)

Hotel Site

President Stover announced the body had three minutes to determine if they'd like to consider using Senate funds to send up to three additional faculty members to attend ASCCC Spring Plenary with him. Senator Persons moved that this Discussion Item be moved to the Action agenda for the next Senate meeting, seconded. Hearing no discussion on the motion, the vote was called and the motion passed. Vote: 27 yes, 1 no.

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

INFORMATION

Celebrating Safelite Scholar Ruben Garcia

President Stover displayed the video (linked above) celebrating [Safelite Foundation Scholar](#) awardee Ruben Garcia, SRJC's Student Government Assembly (SGA) President.

R. Garcia explained he was awarded a \$60,0000 educational scholarship for foster youth as one of the ten applicants selected from a couple hundred applicants across the country. The scholarship, funded by philanthropist Robert F. Smith, not only provides financial support but also access to an influential network, internships, and career opportunities. Ruben credits SRJC's EOPS foster youth division for providing essential resources that helped him realize his potential and pursue higher education. Grateful for the support from faculty and staff, he emphasized the importance of awareness and resources for foster youth, who often face significant educational barriers.

R. Garcia went on to introduce his project, **SRJC's Groundbreaking Student Investment Program (SIP)**: the first student investment program at a U.S. community college, providing accessible financial education and hands-on experience in managing a real investment portfolio. Open to all, including non-SRJC students, the program reinvests funds into student clubs and programs, ensuring that all money benefits students. He asked faculty to spread the word to all their students, using [the email he provided](#).

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.