



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

December 3, 2025, 3:15 p.m. Santa Rosa:
Senate Chambers, Doyle Library 145
Petaluma: Room 690
Richard Call Bldg.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

PRESENT M. Anderman, L. Aspinall (Remote), A. Atilgan Relyea (Petaluma), S. Avasthi (Remote), L. Branen-Ahumada, K. Bunas, J. Bush, J. Davis, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia, V. Hamilton (Petaluma), T. Jacobson, J. Kremer, D. Lemmer, L. D. Lukas, S. McGregor-Gordon, T. Melvin, J. Nieto, M. Ohkubo, M. Papa, N. Perrone (Petaluma), N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), E. Schmidt, I. Tircuit

ABSENT K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia), A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)

GUESTS D. Cavazzi, M. Martin, A.C. Panella

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

LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT STATEMENT The land acknowledgement statement was read by Senator L. Branen-Ahumada.

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.

OPEN FORUM

1. J. Carlin-Goldberg: Math Department Chair

J. Carlin-Goldberg expressed appreciation for the Academic Senate's work on a proposed resolution related to AB 1705 reform and noted passing a resolution would not change current restrictions on offering pre-transfer Math and English courses. She highlighted Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) resources for supporting the reform and encouraged the Senate to adopt and share a resolution with FACCC and local state legislators to add the college's voice to broader advocacy efforts. She also described an adult student returning to school who struggled due to a long gap in Math preparation and limited available options, using this example to illustrate the challenges some students face under current conditions, and concluded by urging the Senate to pass and forward the resolution with any revisions it saw fit.

[The full text of all available open forum statements can be viewed here.](#)

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION

President Stover inquired if there were any objections to Senator Aspinall and Senator Avasthi's remote participation. Hearing none, remote participation was approved.

MINUTES

1. [Minutes of November 19, 2025](#)

Senator D. Lukas moved to approve the minutes of November 19, 2025. Seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy McGregor-Gordon)	yes
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Senator N. Persons made a motion to move both the Discussion and Information items to directly follow the Consent item and appear before the Action Item. Seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	yes
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

REPORTS

President's Report - J. Stover

President Stover thanked Senators and staff for their contributions and emphasized the importance of productivity to advance pending agenda items. He explained procedural issues from the prior meeting, noting that a motion was not repeated due to an extended speaker queue as carried over from the previous meeting and because the document under discussion was a template lacking institutional context and a defined audience. The report highlighted recent statewide Academic Senate plenary outcomes, including the passage of multiple resolutions and the advancement of a locally inspired resolution to the state level, as well as plans to increase local participation in future plenaries and the intention to host state senate leaders on campus during [Spring Plenary 2026](#). Additional updates included the launch of the Gen AI Task Force; ongoing committee and policy work, completion of the Academic Interest Areas (AIAs) focus group; collaboration on strategic enrollment management planning; and appreciation for the ongoing collaborative efforts of faculty, admin, and students.

DISCUSSION:

1. [A Discussion on SRJC Foundation's five year \(2025–30\) Philanthropic Plan](#). The Senate was asked to provide recommendations to three discussion prompts ([see Discussion Item 1, page 2, here](#)). The following contributions were made:

- Provide financial support for student basic needs, including childcare, housing-related expenses, food insecurity, and other emergency costs.
- Expand targeted assistance for noncredit students, who currently have limited access to scholarships and financial support.
- Increase access to technology support, such as laptop loans, repairs, and required software updates tied to instructional equipment.
- Offer relief for course-related and “hidden” costs, including uniforms, tools, supplies, and/or materials required for certain programs not clearly advertised in advance.
- Explore outreach to new and nontraditional donors to support revitalization of campus facilities and programs, including potential rebuilding of the planetarium and restoration of community-facing programs such as Summer Repertory Theatre, in support of strengthen community outreach and engagement.
- Increase support services for students with complex mental health needs that affect classroom participation, including coordinated assistance through social workers, counseling, or specialized support services.
- Reduce the cost of instructional materials by supporting the purchasing of open educational resources (OER) and shared class sets of textbooks, and fund faculty-authored materials aligned with institutional values.
- Apply an equity-focused lens when designing scholarships and philanthropic initiatives, while remaining within legal and regulatory requirements.
- Address funding gaps for ongoing instructional costs, such as required software upgrades associated with workforce and career-technical education equipment.
- Consider financial support options for out-of-state students who face significantly higher per-unit tuition costs.

INFORMATION:

1. **Honors Transfer Programs at California Community Colleges:** [Saddleback Honor's Program Overview](#) and [Honors Program Local Information Sheet](#) – D. Cavazzi, Guest, Saddleback College, Matthew Martin (English) and AC Panella (Communications), SRJC Petaluma

- Saddleback College's equity-based Honors Program emphasizes open access and has removed requirements such as entering GPA and recommendation letters.
- The program enrolls over 600 students and partners with campus support programs (e.g., tutoring, Puente, MESA, DSPS, EOPS, Veteran Education and Transition Services) which also reflect the college's overall student demographics.
- Program outcomes shared included high transfer and completion rates, with most honors completers earning four-year degrees and higher than average university acceptance results.
- The Honors Program offers honors-designated courses open to all students, optional program participation, research opportunities, and support for conference participation.
- Outreach efforts include collaboration with feeder high schools to encourage broad participation and early awareness.
- Membership in the Honors Transfer Council of California (HTCC) was described as providing access to university partnerships, honors pathways, and additional scholarship and financial aid opportunities.
- Faculty discussed the locally developed information sheet outlining possible models for an honors program tailored to District priorities.
- Cost considerations noted honors programs generally do not require additional course funding, with primary costs limited to reassigned time for a program chair; student travel is often supported through student government.
- Completion GPA requirements apply at the end of the program (e.g., 3.25 UC-transferable GPA), while entry is self-selected and open-access.

Senator Circuit made a motion to extend time by 3 minutes. Seconded. President Stover asked if there was any opposition to the motion, and the motion passed. Discussion on the motion continued:

- Honors courses are open to all students, who may take individual classes without formally joining the honors program or pursue full program participation for transcript recognition which supports academic engagement and community building without requiring a long-term commitment.
- Questions were raised about costs and faculty workload, particularly related to smaller class sizes, and it was clarified that honors classes typically have smaller caps aligned with existing course limits and are designed to involve different, not greater, faculty workload.

Senator Circuit requested moving the Information Item to Discussion at a future meeting, and President Stover confirmed such a move would be made in Spring 2026 after current Action Items were resolved.

CONSENT

1. **[CRC-approved Curriculum Writer's Handbook](#).** Does the Senate approve the proposed changes to the handbook? President Stover returned to the Consent item having skipped over it by mistake. The consent item was passed with 26 yes votes and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	Abstain
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

ACTION

1. **[Is the body in support of creating a resolution re: AB1705 Reform?](#)** There is a motion on the table from Senator Melvin not yet assigned to the body "to approve the AB 1705 resolution as it's written" – which was addressed at the top of the item by President Stover.

Support Documents:

- a. [Practices and guidelines for forming a Senate workgroup](#) can be implemented in support of resolution development
- b. [SRJC Local Data {Notes Version}](#)

Since Senator Melvin made a motion last meeting, but no vote was taken, President Stover called on Senator Melvin to speak first. Senator Melvin explained that his original motion was intended to support a statewide statement developed by the Faculty Association of California advocating for expanded student access to below-transfer Math and English courses, which they described as restricted through the Chancellor's Office interpretation of AB 1705 rather than the law itself. He noted that adopting consistent or closely aligned statements across Academic Senates and student groups would strengthen FACC's advocacy efforts at the state level. Acknowledging procedural and technical concerns raised since the prior meeting, the Senator Melvin indicated an intent to amend the motion accordingly.

Senator Melvin moved to pass the resolution as written and change the title to "Santa Rosa Junior College Academic Senate Resolution in support of FACC's AB 1705 advocacy". Seconded. Discussion on the motion:

- Support was expressed for the motion, with a suggestion to frame it around student choice and local control rather than solely as an AB 1705 resolution.
- It was noted the proposed changes are not intended to reinstate extended remedial sequences or require students to enroll in them.
- The motion was described as allowing students the option to take preparatory courses if they choose and enabling local faculty to design courses that respond to student needs.
- It was also suggested that the changes could have a positive effect on enrollment.

Senator Lemmer called for the question, and the vote was taken. The motion passed with 25 yes votes and 2 no votes.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	no
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	no
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

2. AP7120A: Options for Student Involvement and Outside Faculty Member – M. Ohkubo, presenter.
Updated Voting Options for Student Involvement and Non-Discipline Faculty in Faculty Hiring (non-exhaustive)
Re: Student Interaction Demonstrations

- Mandatory student interaction demonstration. *Note:* at the last Senate meeting, Senator Bush made a motion to have mandatory student interaction demonstration as part of student involvement, which was seconded and repeated to the body. ***This motion was taken up first in the item.***

OR

- Optional student interaction demonstration

Senator Bush made a motion last meeting to have a mandatory student interaction demonstration as part of the student involvement. Seconded. The motion passed with 23 yes votes, 3 no votes, and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	abstain
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	no	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	no	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	no

Re: Student SIC participation

- Mandatory student as a voting or nonvoting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides)

OR

- Optional student as a voting member of Screening and Interview Committee

OR

- Optional student as a voting or nonvoting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides)

Senator Lukas made a motion to have optional student participation as a voting or nonvoting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides). Seconded. Discussion on the motion included:

- Concerns were raised about distinguishing between the screening and interview portions, and it was clarified that students would not participate in the screening portion of the Screening and Interview Committee. A concern was raised about what specific Human Resources training students would receive.
- It was stated that students are adults with valuable perspectives, and their inclusion strengthens committee decision-making and honors student voices.
- Others expressed concern that making student participation optional could reduce consistency across committees and equity in the hiring process, create equity concerns and omit student perspectives in hiring decisions.
- Compensation for student participation was discussed; students would be paid if serving on committees as members but not for their participation in student interaction demonstrations.
- It was stated that optional student participation on hiring committees would allow for flexibility.
- It was noted committees could still proceed if a student was unavailable.
- Opponents favored mandatory student participation, emphasizing consistency, equity, and the importance of student perspectives in hiring decisions.

The motion failed and included a presidential tie breaking vote, finalizing the vote at 13 yes votes, 14 no votes, and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	Yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	Yes	J. Nieto	Yes
L. Aspinall	No	G. Garcia	Yes	M. Ohkubo	No
A. Atilgan Relyea	No	V. Hamilton	No	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	No
S. Avasthi	No	T. Jacobson	No	M. Papa	Yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	Yes	J. Kremer	No	N. Perrone	No
K. Bunas	Yes	D. Lemmer	Yes	N. Persons	No
J. Bush	No	D. Lukas	Yes	S. Rosen	No
J. Davis	Yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	No	E. Schmidt	Yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	Abstain	T. Melvin	Yes	J. Stover	No
				I. Tircuit	Yes

Senator Persons made a motion to have mandatory student participation as voting or non-voting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides). Seconded. Discussion on the motion included:

- It was acknowledged that most aspects of the issue had already been thoroughly debated.
- Support was expressed for this compromise option where student participation on committees is mandatory, but their role can be either voting or non-voting.
- It was noted that committees would still proceed even if a student could not be selected.

The motion passed with 16 yes votes, 10 no votes, and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	no	K. Frindell-Teuscher	no	J. Nieto	no
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	no	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	yes
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	no
L. Branen-Ahumada	no	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	no	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	no	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	no
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	abstain	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	no

Senator Bush made a motion to extend time by 10 minutes. Seconded and opposed, so a vote was taken. The motion passed with 25 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	abstain
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	no
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

BREAK

Re: Student SIC participation

- Mandatory outside faculty as a voting member on Screening and Interview Committee

OR

- Mandatory outside faculty as a voting or non-voting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides)

OR

- Optional outside faculty member as a voting or non-voting of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides)

Senator Lukas made a motion to have an optional outside faculty member as a voting or non-voting member of Screening and Interview Committee (committee decides). Seconded. Discussion on the motion included:

- Support was expressed for making outside faculty participation optional to respect faculty autonomy and professional judgment.
- Comparisons were made to prior discussions on mandatory student participation, emphasizing that meaningful participation is more effective when chosen rather than forced.
- Concerns were raised about forcing participation not addressing underlying systemic issues, as policies alone cannot ensure meaningful engagement.
- Arguments in favor of mandatory outside faculty participation highlighted the value of diverse perspectives, including inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, pedagogical expertise, and soft skills, which can improve committee professionalism, decision-making, collaboration, and overall quality.

The motion passed with 15 yes votes, 11 no votes, and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	no	G. Garcia	no	M. Ohkubo	no
A. Atilgan Relyea	no	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	yes
S. Avasthi	no	T. Jacobson	no	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	no	N. Perrone	no
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	no
J. Bush	no	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	no
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	abstain	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

Additional concerns were raised as follows:

- The final hiring decision rests with the President, who may include others in the final interview round to increase transparency while maintaining confidentiality, and how will issues of transparency and accountability be addressed? Also, committee discussions and reference checks are confidential, limiting what can be shared about decision-making rationale.
- Questions were also raised about whether the Senate could make recommendations regarding pre-hiring practices, such as recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. It was noted the current discussion focused on contract faculty hiring, not retention.
- Concerns about fairness in the teaching demonstration portion of interviews for associate faculty were also noted as not fully addressed to date.
- Time ran out on the issue, and it was noted that remaining concerns will be addressed in the spring.

Senator Circuit made a motion to extend time by 5 minutes. Seconded and opposed, so a vote was taken. The motion failed with 8 yes votes, 15 no votes, and 4 abstentions.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	abstain
L. Aspinall	no	G. Garcia	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	no	V. Hamilton	no	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	abstain
S. Avasthi	no	T. Jacobson	no	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	no
K. Bunas	no	D. Lemmer	no	N. Persons	no
J. Bush	no	D. Lukas	no	S. Rosen	no
J. Davis	abstain	S. McGregor-Gordon	no	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati (proxy G. Garcia)	abstain	T. Melvin	no	I. Tircuit	yes

3. **Does the Senate wish to explore the adoption of a standard 16-week academic calendar, and if so, do we wish to establish a senate workgroup to begin the necessary effort required?** The Mira Costa Calendar Project serves as model for how one District moved from 18 weeks to 16 weeks.

Senator Lukas made a motion to establish a work group to investigate the benefits and drawbacks of a 16-week calendar. Seconded. Discussion on the motion included:

- The Mira Costa Calendar Project was again presented as a model for how over a two-year period The Mira Costa Community College District successfully transitioned from an 18-week to a 16-week calendar.
- It was noted that many California Community Colleges have already made this transition and interest was expressed in beginning the exploratory effort.
- Concerns were raised about potential student workload compression with a 16-week semester, but openness was expressed if mitigations like intersessions, additional summer sessions, or splitting larger classes were possible.
- It was confirmed that the District has expressed support for discussing and supporting Senate exploration of a 16-week calendar, and that the work group would gather information on feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages.

Motion passed with 25 yes votes and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia (Proxy Hamilton)	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver (proxy S. McGregor-Gordon)	abstain
S. Avasthi	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	yes	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	absent
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

ADJOURNMENT 4:58 p.m.

[**LINK TO ZOOM RECORDING**](#)

[**LINK TO MEETING TRANSCRIPT**](#)