ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES
February 18, 2026, 3:15 p.m.
Santa Rosa: Senate Chambers, Doyle 145
Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808
Zoom Recording Available Here

PRESENT   M. Anderman, L. Aspinall (remote), A. Atilgan-Relyea (remote), S. Avasthi, L. Branen-Ahumada, J. Davis, K. Fortunati, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia (remote), T. Jacobson (Petaluma), J. Kremer, D. Lemmer (remote), D. Lukas, S. McGregor-Gordon, T. Melvin, G. Morre, J. Nieto, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, M. Papa, N. Perrone, N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), T. Ruiz (Petaluma), I. Tircuit

ABSENT   V. Hamilton (proxy G. Garcia), J. Bush (proxy T. Jacobson), E. Schmidt (proxy D. Lukas)

GUESTS   J. Smotherman, A. Foster

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

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT The land acknowledgement statement was read by Senator A. Oliver.

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. **K. Kinahan:** Work Experience Department, CTE Faculty Liaison (proxy AAII K. Lamb)
    K. Kinahan, CTE Faculty Coordinator advocated for the establishment of a CTE Faculty Liaison and mentioned the essential nature of communication and coordination in support of student success in Career Education. The establishment of a CTE Faculty Liaison will facilitate clear and consistent information in connection with curriculum, pedagogy, and student support to faculty, and will create a formal, faculty-driven connection between Career Education programs and the Academic Senate. Most importantly this role will support students, contribute to their success, strengthen shared governance, and support faculty, and voiced strong support for the creation of a CTE Faculty Liaison to the Academic Senate.

2. **N. Perrone:** Social Sciences
    N. Perrone addressed the amendments to Title II which include required updates for California Community Colleges and other public institutions to meet accessibility standards for all online course-related materials, PDF's, videos, and third- party content. Reviewed that all websites and apps, including Canvas, must comply and be updated by April 24, 2026, encouraged faculty to make all content accessible, and asked the District to develop a better way of communicating to faculty. Noted how accessibility standards support student retention and equity issues, as well as are now a requirement per Title II. Noted the importance of accessibility being addressed.

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION: The Chair inquired if there were any objections to Senators Aspinall, Garcia, Lemmer, and Atilgan Relyea. Seeing none, remote participation was approved.

MINUTES Minutes of February 4, 2026

Senator Lukas moved to approve February 4, 2026, minutes. Seconded. The motion passed with 27 yes votes and 1 abstention.

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA   None.

REPORTS

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

> The Chair gave an update on the AP7120 discussion that will take place today. Reviewed that requiring certain majors to be on the hiring committees could create hardship in areas with small majors which could result in less student participation, the goal is to have as much student engagement as possible. It was noted that best practices and common across other CCCs was student government selecting their own members of hiring committees and also noted that consultations with the co-chairs is already built into our processes and provides the committee with opportunities for feedback.

> The Chair reported meeting with the SGA advisor yesterday. SGA officials serve on about 90-95% of all hiring committees they are asked to participate in. Human Resources does require they attend training sessions regarding the process for selection of students to be included in the hiring committees, and SGA is interested in partnering with Academic Senate on training for students. The SGA advisor stressed the importance of serving on screening and interview committees as an invaluable resource for self-development. SGA chooses candidates during their course of the weekly meetings.

> The Chair also shared updates from the SRJC Board meeting which was held yesterday. Dr. Garcia announced and made public that next year the budget will need to be reduced by ten million dollars. The Chair met with Dr. Garcia and the CFO to discuss the district-wide reductions that will need to be made throughout next academic year (26-27). Notes the work will begin now, that SEIU, AFA and CFT are being consulted, and were consulted before the board meeting. There will be major impact on working conditions. The Academic Senate role will be focused on matters of student success, preparation, retention, and persistence (10+1 matters), and also mentioned the work of the strategic enrollment management work group, which The Chair co-chairs with Dr. Holcomb. Updates will follow.

2. **Accreditation Midterm Report** J. Smotherman

> Accreditation Midterm Report was presented by Dr. Jeremy Smotherman, Director of Institutional Research. The midterm accreditation report outlines progress made since the last comprehensive review and preparations for the next comprehensive review scheduled for Spring 2029. It highlights accomplishments to date and identifies priorities moving forward.

> The report focused on institutional effectiveness, including governance and leadership transitions, shared and participatory governance structures, and student learning outcomes. It was reviewed through the appropriate oversight committee established after the previous comprehensive review.

It presents progress on institutional standards and related performance metrics, as well as ongoing efforts to strengthen the student learning outcomes process and increase its value and engagement among faculty.

Looking ahead, priorities include ensuring alignment with the strategic plan, strengthening governance structures to support communication and decision-making, and using disaggregated student learning outcomes data to inform future decisions. The report also acknowledges the potential impact of federal funding losses, noting that a specific plan is not yet in place but will need to be addressed in preparation for the next comprehensive review.

Comments:

- Many current budget challenges stem from the student-centered funding formula and addressing them may require greater awareness and active engagement with legislators. An upcoming advocacy and policy conference will focus on this formula, offering opportunities to learn and advocate for potential adjustments. There is optimism that these efforts could lead to meaningful improvements.
- The data on page 10 includes only credit certificate completers, which have increased significantly in recent years due to changes in certificate recognition. This rise has created a misalignment with the current institutional standard, prompting a recommendation to review and possibly revise it.

3. **Title V Updates and Course Outlines of Record** A. Foster

   Supporting documentation linked here and here

   Ann Foster presented a report on the Title V Updates and Course Outline of Record that will take effect by Fall 2030. The updates require integrating IDEA principles and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles into all course outlines of record. Curriculum committees must establish a documented procedure explaining how this integration will be achieved.

   To prepare, the committee reviewed guidance from the Chancellor's Office, consulted materials from other colleges, gathered external resources on equity in course design, and discussed the updates regularly since late 2024. As a result, two draft documents have been developed:

   1. A documented procedure intended for inclusion in the Curriculum Writer's Handbook, outlining required elements and guidance for new or revised courses.
   2. A template aligned with that procedure, designed for use in the future web-based course outline system.

   The documents clearly distinguish between Title V required elements and optional strategies for further integrating IDEA and UDL principles. They also include examples from existing courses. The goal is to provide clarity for faculty submitting course proposals, technical review committees, and curriculum committee members, ensuring alignment between written guidance and the online submission system. Revisions to these materials may be needed as the new system is implemented.

   The documented procedure must be approved by April 22. After approval, the institution and district working with the curriculum committee and Academic Senate must develop a plan to review approximately 1,800 courses to meet the Fall 2030 deadline set by the Chancellor's Office. Additional efforts will include communication, training, and professional development to support faculty in integrating these principles. While the institution already has relatively strong course outlines compared to others, significant work remains to meet the new requirements.

   Comments:

   - Appreciation was expressed for the inclusion of clear examples in the guide, which help clarify the type of language being sought. There was also appreciation for having access to course outlines from other courses, noting that this level of access is not always available at other institutions.
   - A question was raised about whether Title V had been changed or if the situation reflected a new

implementation by the Chancellor's office. It was clarified that the language in Title V was formally changed by the legislature.

- A question was raised about how the instructional methodology section should be applied. Specifically, clarification was sought on whether multiple methodologies must be used for each topic covered in the course, or if it is sufficient to incorporate different methodologies at various points throughout the course overall.

INFORMATION

Academic Interest Areas – Student Focus Group Results B. Lamb (absent, proxy J. Stover/J. Smotherman

- An update on Academic Interest Areas – Student Focus Group Results reviewed by J. Smotherman and President Stover.
- An update was provided to give context for a project connected to broader institutional planning efforts. The work involves developing recommendations already reviewed internally, to be forwarded for leadership consideration. A key focus has been organizing academic programs and incorporating stronger student input into the process.
- The report outlined the methodology used, including how data was gathered, scored, and analyzed, along with the resulting conclusions, additional findings, and final recommendations.
- The recommendations reflect student perspectives, highlighting both strengths and areas of confusion. In particular, the findings point to a lack of shared or consistent language among administration, faculty, and students, and emphasize the need to improve clarity and alignment in communication moving forward.

Comments:

- Appreciation was shared for the work completed, along with concerns about underrepresentation of certain perspectives in the information-gathering process. It was suggested that experts in English language learning be more directly involved, especially in reviewing website language, to ensure clearer, more accessible communication beyond simple translation tools.
- Current successful students may reflect a more privileged group, raising concerns about how to make information and resources accessible to those not yet enrolled. Emphasis was placed on finding ways to better reach and support prospective students, even if specific strategies are still to be determined.

CONSENT   None

ACTION

1. **AP7120A: Addressing Final Concerns (including updated AP7120A document)** *(M. Ohkubo)* The Academic Senate will again review the changes approved by the body in Fall 2025, and address final questions and concerns in support of finalizing our mutual collaboration with the District.
   Support Document: AP7120A Addressing Remaining Questions & Concerns [18 February 2026]

   The Chair introduced the item to be reviewed, AP7120A, addressing final concerns. The version presented included the clean policy language that was read at the previous meeting. M. Ohkubo opened the discussion to final concerns.

Senator L. Branen-Ahumada moved to add a statement to the section of the procedure on lines 285 through 300: "Student interaction demonstrations will be designed to provide an equivalent experience to all applicants."

Discussion:

- Clarification was requested regarding the appropriate placement of the proposed sentence, with a suggestion that it be added at the end of the document, following line 300.
- It was further recommended that qualifying language such as "as much as possible" be included to acknowledge that full equivalency may not be feasible. Even when applicants teach the same course or group of students for demonstration purposes, variables such as class timing and student composition may differ, making it unlikely that conditions will be 100% identical for all candidates.
- Senator Branen was amenable to a motion if a proposed friendly amendment adds to the phrase, "as much as possible"
- Senator Lukas proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to add "as much as possible" to the sentence, seconded.
- President clarified what impact the amendment would have on the motion on the floor.
- Point of clarification was made regarding the vote.
- Members expressed concern regarding the grammatical clarity of the phrase "as much as possible," noting that it may be interpreted in multiple ways—either as "as often as possible" or "as close as possible." Clarification was requested to ensure the intended meaning is explicit.
- Parliamentary and procedural questions followed and were addressed.
- A question was asked about wording and wordsmithing, both in the meeting and after. The Chair emphasized the importance of clearly defining the proposed wording and noted it was unclear whether the approved wording would meet Human Resources standards.
- The Chair recommended, if the body so agreed, to proceed with the vote on the proposed amendment. There was no objection, and the vote was taken. The amendment was voted down unanimously with 28 No votes.

The discussion returned to the original motion: Student interaction demonstrations will be designed to provide an equivalent experience to all applicants. The Chair paused to call on the Vice President of Human Resources (VPHR), who attended the meeting, and asked for input on the language under consideration. The VPHR confirmed the language under consideration was feasible and that adding "when possible" was advisable.

Senator Lukas made a friendly amendment to add the phrase "when possible" to the existing motion: "Student interaction demonstrations will be designed to provide an equivalent experience to all applicants," seconded.

The Chair asked if there was any discussion, and called on Petaluma and Senator Rosen, who suggested "a friendly amendment to whenever possible" and the Chair clarified that an amendment had just been made and that a vote was required on that proposed amendment first.

There was no discussion on the amendment and the vote was taken. The amendment was voted up unanimously with 28 Yes votes.

The motion was perfected as follows: Student Interaction Demonstrations will be designed to provide an equivalent experience to all applicants when possible.

Senator Ohkubo shared with the body that HR will be coming with operational updates to faculty hiring after the EEO plan draft is ready after the end of March, and that operational elements for faculty hiring are not part of policy or procedure. Seeing no other discussion on the perfected motion, the vote was taken and the perfected motion passed with 27 yes votes and 1 no vote.

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

The Chair picked up from the queue and concerns about the reference checks being electronic, which are not addressed in the updated document, in addition to faculty not being involved, asked if anyone else had concerns about electronic reference checks and the lack of faculty involvement.

A request to review lines 147 and 148 with some of the information we got from the President's report today, which is appreciated, would like to offer alternate wording.

Senator Mark Anderman made a motion to replace lines 147 and 148 with the following: A student representative from the hiring discipline, or a closely related field, recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly. Seconded.

A point of order regarding extending the time of the item without getting approval of the body.
Senator Oliver moved to extend the time 17 minutes; Seconded. The motion passed with 27 yes votes and 1 no vote.

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

The Chair repeated the motion made by Senator Anderman for replacing lines 147 and 148.
"A student representative from the hiring discipline, or closely related field, recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly."
Discussion:
- Members expressed concern that "closely related discipline" is undefined and could be interpreted too broadly.
- Some felt revising the language may be perceived as disrespectful to the Student Government Assembly (SGA) and preferred retaining the current wording.
- It was noted that the existing language already allows collaboration with SGA and provides committees flexibility in determining appropriate student involvement.

- The teaching demonstration was identified as an opportunity for student feedback, with discipline-specific participation included when appropriate, though not required for all appointments.
- Senator Tircuit made a friendly amendment to the motion as follows:
  - A student representative ~~from the hiring discipline, or closely related field,~~ recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly**.**

Senator Anderman stated by removing the discipline expertise that the committee will recruit and appoint a student in collaboration with the Student Government Association. Seconded.

The Chair reviewed the motion: Replace lines 147 to 148 with: A student representative recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly. No further discussion on the motion occurred, and the vote was taken. The amendment to the motion passed with 15 yes votes and 13 no votes.

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

The perfected motion is to replace lines 147 and 148 with the following: "A student representative recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly."
Discussion:
- Reviewing the existing language, we are adding duties to the screening and interview committee and appointing the student.
- The original language appears to be more clear and more precise.

Time expired on the item. The motion will come back next meeting.

BREAK

DISCUSSION
*note items marked **[urgent*]** can be moved to Action and voted on in the same meeting*
1. ***Does the Academic Senate wish to recommend the establishment of a CTE Faculty Liaison? [urgent*]*** **Should** the body proceed, the District and AFA would need to take up the matter at their earliest convenience due to upcoming funding deadlines (before March 31, 2026).
   Support Document: CTE Liaison Summary for Academic Senate 18 February 2026

   The Chair opened the item with the following: CTE liaison role would elevate the ability to collect and disseminate information to faculty, from faculty, in support of students and their career goals. It would create an official position to report back and engage in shared governance, so this faculty would not only be teaching, but engaging in cross-communication and collaboration on a broader level. Reviewed funding deadline of March 30. **Discussion:**
   - A Senator asked about the funding source – it was answered career education grant out of strong workforce funding.

- Another Senator stated additional funding is needed to better connect credit and non-credit programs, which are described as operating in silos and lacking sufficient resources. The need for a dedicated effort to bridge these areas, similar to approaches used at other institutions. The concern expressed is that non-credit programs continue to be overlooked in planning and resource allocation.
- Questions were raised about how the role would interact with Career Education (CE) staff, whether it would report to the CE Dean, whether it would add new faculty representation in CE matters, and whether the position is necessary.
- Supporters favored exploring the creation of the liaison role, arguing that CTE faculty perspectives are often underrepresented in the Academic Senate and across the District. They believed a liaison could advocate broadly for CTE-related issues and fill what they see as a missing leadership role in Career Education, which serves a large portion of the student population.
- Opponents argued that other needs should take priority, specifically noting that the ITT program has long requested a CTE lab assistant or shop manager. They contend that fulfilling that request would have a more direct and meaningful impact than creating the proposed liaison position.

Time expired on the item, and the Chair mentioned more support materials will be developed in answer to the questions raised.

2. **How can we support the institutionalization of student involvement (9+1) on the Academic Senate?**
Carrying over this topic from our Spring Retreat, how can we more proactively support the inclusion of the student voice in our deliberations?
Support Document: Student Rights in Shared Governance (9+1)
Support Document: *ASCCC Rostrum Article* **Honoring Student Voice: Ensuring Students' Effective Participation in Governance (April 2018) by Julie Bruno**

The Chair reported this topic was first brought up by the Senators at the Spring Retreat. **Discussion:**
- Members discussed the possibility of recruiting a student to serve on the Senate as a non-voting member. It was noted that this would be permissible but would require a motion and vote of the body.
- The addition of a voting student member would require amendments to the Constitution and/or Bylaws, pending the body's interest in pursuing that option.
- Discussion focused on whether to formalize student participation through a voting or honorary seat, versus increasing engagement through reports, forums, or other avenues. Members noted that attendance alone does not ensure meaningful participation and raised questions about consistency in shared governance practices and the potential impact on collaboration.

Senator Persons moved to make the discussion item an action item for the next meeting. Seconded.

There was no additional discussion on the motion, and the vote was taken. The motion was passed unanimously with 28 yes votes.

ADJOURNMENT   The meeting was adjourned by The Chair at 5:00 p.m.