ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MINUTES
CALL TO ORDER 3:15 p.m.
21 October 2026, 3:15 p.m.
Santa Rosa: Senate Chambers, Doyle 145
Petaluma: Mahoney Library 726, 2nd Floor, Petaluma.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

PRESENT M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, L. Branen-Ahumada, K. Bunas (remote), J. Bush, J. Davis, K. Fortunati, V. Hamilton (Petaluma), A. Hsieh, T. Jacobson (Petaluma), D. Lukas, J. Lusk, T. Melvin, J. Nieto, A. Oliver, M. Ohkubo, M. Papa, N. Perrone (remote), T. Ruiz (Petaluma), I. Stockburger, I. Tircuit, N. Tran, N. Wheeler

ABSENT S. Avasthi (proxy Oliver), S. Rosen (proxy Hamilton), E. Schmidt (proxy Lukas)

CALL TO ORDER 3:15 P.M.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT - The Land Acknowledgement was read by Senator Ohkubo.

> *We acknowledge that we gather at Santa Rosa Junior College on the territorial traditional land of the Pomo People in Santa Rosa and the Coast Miwok People in Petaluma, past and present, and honor with gratitude the land itself and the people who have stewarded it throughout the generations.*

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION BY SENATORS: Senator Bunas and Senator Perrone. No objection to participating remotely.

OPEN FORUM None

MINUTES Minutes of 7 October 2026

Senator Lukas made a motion to approve the October 7, 2026, minutes. Seconded. Approved by 25 yes, 1 absent, 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	A. Hsieh	yes	N. Perrone	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	T. Jacobson	absent	S. Rosen (proxy Hamilton)	yes
S. Avasthi (proxy Oliver)	yes	D. Lukas	yes	T. Ruiz	abstain
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Lusk	yes	E. Schmidt (proxy Schmidt)	yes
K. Bunas	Yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Stockburger	yes
J. Bush	yes	J. Nieto	yes	I. Tircuit	yes
J. Davis	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes	N. Tran	yes
K. Fortunati	yes	A. Oliver	yes	N. Wheeler	yes

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA - Senator Ohkubo moved to pull Consent item #1, Resolution in honor of Frank Aspinall, so it can be approved by acclamation. President Stover noted that a vote of acclamation is the highest honor shared in the Academic Senate.

DRAFT

REPORTS

1. President's Report – J. Stover **President's Report**

- The link to the Fall Plenary Resolutions is included in the President's Report. The Resolutions will be the topic of an agendized Discussion item at the November 4 Senate meeting. It was requested to circulate the packet and gather feedback from constituents for this Discussion item to help inform the Chair on how the Senate would like him to vote to best represent Santa Rosa Junior College.
- Last week, the Chair attended the California Community College Association for Occupational Education (CCCAOE) Fall Conference. The Chair thanked Dean Brad Davis for sending him to the conference for the past two years. Outcomes included connecting with Araceli Nunez, North Bay Subregion Coordinator from the Bay Area Community College Consortium. She will be attending a future Academic Senate meeting to help the Senate learn about regional opportunities and resources for supporting SRJC programs and connecting students to career opportunities.
- A request was received to agendize the topic of Banner implementation. Based on the questions in the request, the extensive history of town hall meetings and Senate contributions on the decision to move from SIS to Banner is being documented. Banner updates will continue to be a standing agenda item.
- There is increased ICE activity in Sonoma County, and both the local Senate resolution and a state resolution encourage faculty to provide flexibility in their attendance and participation policies for all students during these challenges.
- An update was provided regarding upcoming meetings of the Academic Senate Task Force exploring the advantages of a 16-week calendar.
- The Chair thanked Laura Sparks and Senators Ohkubo, Nieto, and Hamilton for their committee work. Three faculty members are needed for the Program Review Committee, and one needs to be a department chair.

INFORMATION

1. **Banner Implementation Update** *(Standing Item)* R. Holcomb, J. Adams

- Dr. Holcomb, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, reported that faculty load cards remain in development, and that Timekeeper and the Work Experience Module are undergoing validation testing. Additional technical integration is needed for CVC functionality and library services. CVC implementation may occur in late spring 2027 or later.

J. Adams reviewed the following:

- Scheduling issues associated with importing summer and fall 2026 SIS data into Banner are still being addressed. Spring, summer, and fall 2027 schedules are being built in CourseLeaf CLSS, with each CRN created individually. Summer and fall 2027 schedules will be released separately. The goal is to resume combined summer and fall scheduling in 2028 and return to the usual annual schedule update process.
- Faculty will be able to view load cards through BearCub Hub, accept or decline assignments, and contact the Scheduling Office with questions. Responses will generate email notifications and records for reporting and follow-up. Users with advisor roles will be able to view faculty assignment details and acceptance status.
- Curriculum: CourseLeaf CIM is scheduled to be activated on October 29. In-person training is scheduled for November 3–4, with company representatives providing on-campus instruction. Training will also be available through Zoom, and sessions will be recorded.

L. Beach reviewed the following:

- California Virtual College (CVC): As a Home College, the College's online courses are not currently listed on the CVC, and Ellucian is working on this now. Further technical work is required to enable the College to become a CVC Teaching College.
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): Some users have reported inaccurate SLO information. The software is not currently connected to a system containing up-to-date SLO data. Faculty experiencing issues while conducting assessments are encouraged to submit a DE ticket.
- Weekly Banner Transition Updates: Thursday emails now include a table at the bottom containing technical details regarding the Banner transition. The information comes directly from Ellucian and may not always be clearly explained. Staff are encouraged to contact DE with questions.
- Peer Online Course Review (POCR) Pilot: The POCR pilot is underway; progress includes faculty peer reviewers

DRAFT

participating and course authors submitting courses for review.

- A Senator inquired whether historical load data would be available to help chairs and deans track contract load balances. J. Adams indicated that historical data would be incorporated if compatible; otherwise, SIS would remain the source for those records.
- A Senator inquired about the enrollment challenges last semester and if they have been resolved.
  - It was reported that enrollment issues are slowing down; 90% of the issues have been resolved.
  - From Scheduling Office side, they have decided to not publish the finals until after enrollment is over for the full semester courses. Finals will not be scheduled until after classes start.

2. **Strategic Enrollment Management Workgroup Update** R. Holcomb
   - **a)** Proposed New Focus of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP)
   - b) Proposed Outline for the Revised SEMP

- R. Holcomb reviewed the five-year SEMP goal of restoring enrollment to 17,500 FTES following a post-pandemic decline to approximately 12,500 FTES. Enrollment reached 15,439 FTES by the end of the plan's third year. He indicated that the original target is unlikely to be met by 2027–28 and reviewed a proposed shift toward continuous improvement, productivity, retention, and completion. Potential components of the revised plan include an updated environmental scan, FTES targets, funding metrics, tutorial services, and standardized attendance accounting. Faculty participation in drafting the revision was also discussed.

- Senators raised concerns about entry-level math persistence and the effects of AB 1705. Math persistence was identified as a possible recommendation for the revised plan.
- Senators questioned the allocation model, early class cancellations, and the 22-student course minimum, including their effects on enrollment and student support. Shortcomings in the allocation model were acknowledged, and the timing of cancellations would be brought forward for discussion.
- Senators requested clearer definitions of productivity, attention to programs receiving higher apportionment, and participation from career education and public safety faculty. The workgroup is developing metrics and baselines for departments and programs.
- A senator requested a link to De Anza College's strategies for maximizing funding metrics.

  Time ran out on the topic.

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

1. Resolution in Honor of Frank Aspinall's Contributions to Senate History

President Stover and Senate Executive members, L. Aspinall and M. Ohkubo, presented Frank Aspinall with the Resolution honoring his contributions to Senate history.

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

1. ***Proposed Change to Associate Area Representation and Distribution.*** Does the Academic Senate support the following change to associate representation in support of more equitable distribution?

   Area 12 (Areas 1, 4, 6, & 10) = 187 faculty members
   Area 13 (Areas 2, 3, 7, 9, & Lifelong Learning) = ~~122~~ 179 faculty members
   Area 14 (Associate: Areas 5, ~~7,~~ 8, ~~9,~~ 11) = ~~294~~ 237 faculty members

   *Please note that the election for the open Associate Senator seat in Area 13 will be run **after** this topic is addressed by the body.*

- The Chair introduced the item, a proposed change of the Associate Area distribution. Noted this was discussed at the last Senate meeting. This is a one-time change to make areas as equitable as possible. If the need persists, the

issue will be escalated to review the Bylaws to see how they could be more flexible.

- Senator Bush made a motion to adopt the proposed change to Associate Area representation and distribution as reflected in our Bylaws. Seconded.
- The Chair noted that changing the Bylaws requires a two-thirds vote to pass. Approved unanimously by 27 yes votes.

BREAK

DISCUSSION (4:20 – 5:00) *note: items marked **[urgent*]** can be moved to Action and voted on in the same meeting*

1. **Proposed Treasurer Options as requested by Senators from ASEC Committee Members as of 21 October 2026 (20 min)**
    a. ***Current fiscal activities of Academic Senate President and Administrative Assistant***
    b. ***CCC Senate Treasurer Positions Across the State identified by Claude***
    c. ***CCC State Treasurer Positions***

The Chair introduced the item and reviewed the options: Separate Role Proposal, Integrated Approach Options, or Elimination Approach.

- A Senator noted that it would be unlikely to get the separate role approved although it would be nice to have an additional role. The elimination of current representation does not seem favorable. The Integrated Approach, Option A, seems like an obvious choice.
- A Senator inquired about the At-Large position; there is not much difference between the At-Large and the Treasurer position. Inquired if the At-Large position could be turned into a Treasurer position.
- A Senator spoke in favor of the Separate Role option, and that it should be inquired about. If denied, then a substitute plan for those duties will be needed. The Senate's job is to ask for what is operationally needed, and what is needed is a separate role for the Treasurer position. ASEC members are already maxed out on the percentages allotted; there will be no time if these duties are absorbed to be on other committees, as needed.
- A Senator raised the concern of the Senate President handling the Treasurer duties.
    - The Chair noted that anything paid out of the Senate bank account requires two signatures.

Senator Bush made a motion to move this Discussion item to Action. Seconded. Approved unanimously by 27 yes votes.

2. **The Reorganization of Academic Affairs (20 min).** *The following proposals have been put forward thus far:*
    a. ***Academic Affairs Reorganization (Sept 2nd) 1st Update***
    b. ***Academic Affairs Reorganization (Sept 16th) 2nd Update***

The Chair explained that the item was placed on the Discussion agenda by request to provide an opportunity to record questions and concerns. Questions would be forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

- A senator inquired whether additional proposals were anticipated and whether a timeline had been established. It was reported that SRJC Forward had submitted a proposal to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and that it had been shared with deans and managers. The understanding was that no decisions had been made.
- A Senator raised a question regarding STEM Success Center and the PALS program in the Learning Resources category in terms of how things will be done on the department level if changes occur, if it will be the same as it is currently, if the department will still be doing the hiring, or if this will change.
- A Senator expressed that several of their constituents in the dance program are in favor of the second version from September 16 and wondered at what point we will know which version will be brought forward. Reasons in support of version two include getting back on their feet after a lot of recent upheaval and wanting to stay where they are. There are too many uncertainties and questions about what might happen and not feeling secure making that move.
- A Senator noted that it is unlikely that the Senate will be given any information until the Early Retirement Initiative (ERI) has taken place to see what workforce will be left. It is good to state preferences or goals of individual

DRAFT

departments or programs now to get on the record to inform the discussion.

- A Senator voiced concerns that it is troublesome that the formation of the structure is based on staffing and not programmatic and facility needs with little impact on our fiscal solvency. As a Senate, there is an opportunity to deliver a message of what our values are and what we as a Senate want the work to be.
- A Senator requested to see the SRJC Forward proposal come to the next Senate meeting. Concerns with the second draft in area six and the siloing that is there for non-credit. Questions were raised about offsite programs and if they include CCAP and what are we doing to provide equity and to get students ready to bridge into credit classes.
- A Senator noted that constituents do not support either version from September 2 or September 16 based on the lack of understanding of academic programs and the interdisciplinary work that is underway and are losing confidence in administrative transparency and competency.
- A Senator requested clarification on why English for Multilingual Students (EMLS) is listed under foundational learning and not with English and World Languages based on the description of this area.
- A Senator expressed that the cut of department chairs and making bigger departments would save money.
- A Senator inquired why Petaluma is listed as an academic area when it is a location which teaches all the same classes Santa Rosa teaches and why STEM Success Center is under Humanities and Language when it is Science, Technology and Math.
- A Senator noted this is supposed to be a place that is governed by partnership between the administration and faculty. If there was transparency about what is going on, then the faculty could offer their good ideas. At this point, the faculty do not know what is on the table.
- A Senator inquired why we are reorganizing with the ERI, a budget deficit and reorganization, including Banner issues and requests a reminder of the initial vision of the reorganization from the President's Office or the Cabinet so that Senate can use the 10 + 1 lens to give feedback focusing on why it makes pedagogical, student success, professional development, or curricular sense.
- The Chair reviewed that the discussion has to do with specific questions about the proposed plan, whether we want to pursue our own proposal, and what values we think are important in a reorganization.
- A Senator inquired how the topic could be an action.
    - The Chair clarified that the Senate could vote to send questions, set values, or come up with our own reorganization plan.

Senator Lukas moved the topic of the reorganization of Academic Affairs to Action. Seconded. Approved by 25 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain.

M. Anderman	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	A. Hsieh	no	N. Perrone	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	S. Rosen (proxy Hamilton)	yes
S. Avasthi (proxy Oliver)	yes	D. Lukas	yes	T. Ruiz	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Lusk	yes	E. Schmidt (proxy Schmidt)	yes
K. Bunas	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Stockburger	yes
J. Bush	yes	J. Nieto	yes	I. Tircuit	yes
J. Davis	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes	N. Tran	abstain
K. Fortunati	yes	A. Oliver	yes	N. Wheeler	yes

ADJOURNMENT 5:00 p.m.

DRAFT