



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

March 4, 2026, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Senate Chambers, Doyle 145

Petaluma (New): Mahoney Library

726, 2nd Floor, Petaluma

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

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

ABSENT A. Atilgan Relyea (proxy M. Ohkubo), S. Avasthi (proxy A. Oliver), S. Rosen (absent)

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 J. Nieto.

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

[Link to Available Open Forum Statements Here](#)

1. M. Anderman: Music

M. Anderman spoke on proposed language regarding a student representative appointed in collaboration with student government. Multiple departments submitted statements reflecting varied perspectives on student inclusion, faculty roles, and representation. Comments described an approach combining collaboration with student government and committee discretion over participation.

2. J. Nieto: Health Sciences

J. Nieto read a statement on behalf of Elizabeth Simas supporting student participation in hiring committees. It recommended that recruitment be led by the hiring department in consultation with student government, emphasized the value of student input, and noted the importance of selecting students familiar with the discipline. Senator Nieto mentioned that no position was taken by the Ethnic Studies Department.

3. L. Aspinall: Disability Resources

L. Aspinall read a statement on behalf of Ashley Arnold outlining Banner implementation concerns and student support needs. It noted potential effects from shifting enrollment functions, possible delays due to centralization, and limited training access. The statement requested assurance that priority registration would not be delayed and called for consideration of a pause pending a clearer plan.

4. V. Hamilton: Counseling - Petaluma

V. Hamilton read a statement on behalf of Jessica Paisley raising concerns about Banner implementation and readiness for summer registration. It cited limited staff access, training, and communication, along with potential confusion for students about new systems. The statement called for coordination with district leadership or consideration of a delay to reduce registration barriers.

MINUTES [Minutes of February 18, 2026](#)

A Senator requested to make a clarification on page 5 of the minutes; the suggestion for additional language should appear at the end of the section on student interaction rather than at the end of the document.

Senator Persons moved to approve the February 18, 2026, minutes with the recommended edit. Seconded.

The motion passed with 26 yes votes, 1 abstention, 1 absent.

M. Anderman	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	A. Oliver	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea (Proxy Ohkubo)	yes	J. Kremer	yes	M. Papa	yes
S. Avasthi (proxy Oliver)	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	absent
J. Davis	yes	T. Melvin	yes	T. Ruiz	yes
K. Fortunati	yes	G. Morre	yes	E. Schmidt	abstain
K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes	I. Tircuit	yes
G. Garcia	yes				

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

The Chair requested an adjustment to the agenda:

An adjustment to the agenda was proposed to include an emergency resolution regarding the inclusion of Lifelong Learning faculty in Area 13 of the associate electorate. Adding the item would typically require a two-thirds vote. The process of asking for unanimous consent was suggested. Members were asked if there was any opposition to adding the resolution to the agenda. With no opposition, the resolution was added under the Consent agenda.

The Chair requested adding a brief President's report to provide several updates that came up during the week. With no opposition from members, the President's report was allowed to be included under reports.

A Senator requested the Title V update and course outline be moved to an action item. The Chair asked if anyone is opposed. Seeing no opposition, this Consent item was moved to action.

REPORTS

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

The Chair reported that Associate Academic Areas 12, 13 and 14 have been created (14) and updated (all). The website will be updated as well. As a reminder, please encourage people to run for open seats. We are accepting candidate statements and photos up until midnight tonight. Scholarships for the Spring Plenary are still available pretty much across the board, but particularly for Career Education faculty. Please reach out to your constituents and encourage them to join us at the plenary meeting. The Area B meeting is next Friday, March 13th, if anyone would like to join. Also, at DCC yesterday, Cathy Prince put together a DDAD survey and is looking for input.

- What support or resources do you and your department need to create and analyze meaningful and impactful SLOs?
- How can we make Department Designated Activity Day (DDAD) more effective for you and your departments?
- If you could add one thing to DDAD Day, what would you change?
- Would it be helpful to include time for accessibility training?
- Other thoughts on the structure of the day, ideas for improvement.
- Input is needed; the Department Chairs are going to reach out to you and ask that you to fill out this survey.
- Faculty suggestions will be carried forward in the planning.

The Chair thanked the body for the opportunity to update.

INFORMATION

Academic Interest Areas – [Faculty Focus Group](#) & [Overall Results](#) - B. Lamb/J. Smotherman, Institutional Research Office.

Blair Lamb shared results from the faculty focus groups conducted as part of a college initiative exploring the development of career and academic pathways. The faculty focus groups were designed to mirror earlier student focus groups and used the same questions to compare perspectives between the two groups. Four faculty focus groups were held (two online), with 23 faculty participating out of 50 available spots. The discussions addressed the following:

- *Naming format for pathways or program groupings:* Faculty participants strongly preferred one naming model (“option 2”), which they felt was clearer and more understandable for students.
- *Student-facing website interface:* Participants reviewed examples of how pathway information could be presented online.
- *Motivational statements for pathway categories:* Both faculty and students reacted negatively to sample motivational statements shown during the sessions. The concept of including motivational messaging itself was not broadly rejected.

Additional discussion:

- Feedback from earlier focus groups reflected perspectives of students under 25.
- Some faculty raised concerns that certain disciplines do not clearly align with the proposed six pathway categories and may not fully capture all academic fields. Clarification was provided that groupings were not yet finalized and the framework is still in development.
- The team plans to review feedback and continue refining the model, with future updates to be shared and additional opportunities for faculty and departmental input anticipated.

CONSENT

1. **Resolution re: Lifelong Learning in Area 13:** A resolution was presented regarding the inclusion of a Lifelong Learning group within one of the Academic Senate’s associate areas. It was recently discovered that the group had already been placed in Associate Area 13, though it was unclear when or by whom this occurred. The resolution proposed several actions:

- Formally affirming and supporting the group’s inclusion in Associate Area 13.
- Confirming their right to vote in Area 13 elections.
- Updating the Senate Bylaws and constitution to reflect their inclusion in an associate area.
- Committing to their continued inclusion in the future.

Clarification was requested about whether Consent items can be discussed. The Chair clarified that consent items are not debatable, and a senator asked to remove the item from Consent to allow for discussion. The request was declined as the agenda adjustment period had already passed.

The vote was taken, and the motion passed with 25 yes votes, 2 no, 1 absent.

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

(minutes continued next page)

ACTION

- 1. Title V Updates and Course Outlines of Record - A. Foster (moved from Consent)**
Does the Academic Senate wish to update SRJC's Curriculum Writer's Handbook with the CRC-approved "Course Outline of Record (COR) Equity Requirements and Recommendations Guide" to serve as SRJC's Curriculum Committee's documented procedure to its work align Title 5, Section § 55001?
Does the Academic Senate wish to adopt the CRC-approved "COR Equity Review Checklist for CourseLeaf" Course Outline of Record template as an additional 'documented procedure to serve as SRJC's Curriculum Committee's documented procedure to its work align Title 5, Section § 55001?

The item was moved from Consent to action, and Senator Melvin was called upon first (as the maker of the motion to move to Action). His review of the document highlighted concerns re: additional elements to be included in course outlines of record as follows:

- Some proposed requirements may not be appropriate for inclusion in course outlines.
- Certain document language could be difficult or impossible for some departments to follow.
- The proposal might create extra administrative work without necessarily producing meaningful or equitable outcomes.
- Suggested revising the language to be more flexible, using phrasing like “whenever possible” and/or “should” rather than strict requirements.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to having CRC Faculty Co-Chair Ann Foster answer concerns raised thus far. Hearing none, A. Foster provided these clarifications:

- The discussion reviewed proposed course outline guidelines, distinguishing between required elements based on Title V regulations (in blue) and optional recommendations that faculty can adapt to fit their disciplines (non-bolded).
- “100% possible” to add “when possible” and/or “should” to the language.
- The non-highlighted language refers to other sources highlighting equity-based language and other statewide resources.
- Applying the principles may vary across academic fields, with flexibility in wording and implementation considered important due to differences in disciplinary practices.

A senator raised concerns re: limited faculty familiarity with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in certain disciplines, and highlighted the need for professional development, discipline-specific guidance, and additional resources to support training and need to update courses within tight timelines. A. Foster highlighted the use of multiple tools of assessment, an element of UDL, in all courses as already present in SRJC Course Outlines of Record (CORs) and noted that IDEAA and UDL discussions at the state have been ongoing for last seven years. Concern was also raised about potential loss of academic freedom as pertains to proposed standards, some of which might be better suited for syllabi versus CORs.

Time expired on the topic, and Senator Lukas made a motion to extend the time by 5 minutes. Seconded, with no opposition.

Senator Lukas made a motion to accept the two Title V updates about course outlines of record as presented. Seconded. A Procedural question was raised on the nature of the motion and vote. The Chair clarified the vote would be on accept the document presented by CRC as presented to the Academic Senate.

The motion was repeated, and an additional question inquired where the proposed documents would be located.

A. Foster clarified that the proposed checklist would be added to the Curriculum Writer’s Handbook and represented a required documented procedure that must be in place by April 22, 2026. The proposed template aligns with the checklist and will support faculty as they input data into the new CORs as reflective of the new standards.

An additional clarification was sought to confirm that the vote would reflect what is required versus what is “when possible” and/or “should” as previously discussed (*see second set of bullet points on page four*). A. Foster correctly noted the vote would be on documents as presented and highlighted the openness and willingness of CRC in making revisions and updates.

A senator indicated they would vote no and wanted more time to review the language specific to adding “should” and “when possible.”

A senator asked for clarification requiring timing specific to forwarding these documents to the next Board meeting, and it was determined that should the body not take action today, we would not be able to address the item at the next Senate meeting (1 April 2026) as it would be one day past the 14-day leadup to agendaizing Board items. Another senator asked for clarification on the implications of voting or not voting, and The Chair highlighted different options for moving forward and how he could advocate for inclusion if the item reappeared on the April 1st senate agenda.

Time again expired on the issue, and Senator Persons moved to extend the time on this item by 3 minutes. Seconded, with no objection. A senator stated they would be voting no, and both respects CRC’s work and desires for more Senate time for discussion. Another senator asked for clarification regarding the vote as including both documents. The Chair confirmed that was true.

The vote was taken, and the motion passed 15 yes votes, 12 no, 1 absent.

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

BREAK

- AP7120A: Addressing Final Concerns (including AP7102A 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. (35 min) **Support Document: [AP7120A Addressing Remaining Questions & Concerns \[18 February 2026\]](#)**

M. Ohkubo presented the item and asked for final questions or concerns. A previous motion made by Senator Anderman on the floor to replace lines 147 to 148 of the proposed AP7120A with “a student representative recruited and appointed by the committee in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly when possible” was considered. Discussion took place regarding how students should be included on faculty hiring committees:

- Under the current policy, student government has no formal role in faculty hiring; departments may invite students if they choose.
- In 2023, the Senate unanimously approved a revision allowing departments to add a student to hiring committees, with departments selecting the student.

- Suggestion to give Student Government Association (SGA) the role of appointing student representatives and consulting departments afterward.
- Reduces departmental control.

The motion was reviewed:

- Replace lines 147-148 with “A student representative recruited and appointed by the committee, in collaboration with the Student Government Assembly when possible”.
- A comment was made regarding inviting student participation while keeping departments primarily responsible for selecting the student as a compromise.

A further discussion took place regarding:

- Compromise with inviting student participation while keeping departments primarily responsible for selecting the student.
- It would maintain faculty and departmental leadership in hiring.
- Departments could choose students familiar with the discipline, which could provide more relevant feedback.
- Collaboration with SGA would still occur.
- Students provide valuable input about teaching and communication from a learner’s perspective.
- Requiring committees to recruit students could create extra administrative steps.
- Allowing SGA to appoint representatives supports shared governance and partnership with students.
- Changing the wording might reduce the perceived role or respect given to student government.
- Students do not need disciplinary expertise to contribute.

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

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

The Chair highlighted there was 16 minutes left to address final concerns on this item. A discussion followed about a proposal requiring reference checks to be conducted electronically:

- Using electronic methods as the only option is a concern.
- Electronic reference checks are considered “best practice,” stating that a quick review of available information did not clearly support that, and more research should be provided before adopting the policy.
- The value of phone conversations or other direct communication during reference checks allows for follow-up questions and more detailed discussions about candidates.
- Concerns about AI-generated emails or responses, and that such technologies can also affect voice or video interactions.
- Concerns were raised about the role of Human Resources in conducting reference checks.
- Faculty members or administrators from relevant departments should be involved.

Senator Kremer made a motion to amend the current statement regarding electronic reference checks to include the use of faculty on the hiring committee. Further discussion took place regarding the process and included a request to review and revise some of the information.

Senator Kremer withdrew the motion. The Chair asked if there was any opposition to the motion being withdrawn. Seeing none, the motion was withdrawn.

Senator Persons moved to postpone further discussion of this matter until the next meeting (1 April 2026). Seconded, with no opposition. The item will be brought back.

3. How can we support the institutionalization of student involvement (9+1) on the Academic Senate? (10 min) 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](#)

A senator spoke in favor of having an SGA representative on the Academic Senate as appointed by the SGA. Another senator spoke in favor of including students as supportive of their ongoing development

Senator Persons moved to establish a seat on the Academic Senate for a non-voting SGA representative appointed by the SGA. Seconded.

A senator asked about related senate procedures needed if the body moves to approve, and The Chair clarified that the Senate's constitution and bylaws would need to be updated. The same senator asked if practices at other colleges could also be researched and shared. Senator Persons, as maker of the motion, highlighted the need and benefit of having a student representative on the Academic Senate regardless of what other colleges are doing.

The motion passed with 26 yes votes, 2 absent.

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

DISCUSSION

1. Does the Academic Senate wish to recommend the establishment of a CTE Faculty Liaison? [urgent*]

CTE Funding is available to support the position (funding deadline is March 31, 2026). (15 min)

Support Document: [CTE Liaison Summary for Academic Senate 18 February 2026](#)

[New] Proposed CTE Liaison Summary of Responsibilities at SRJC (as inspired by Allan Hancock College)

The Importance of Designated CTE Liaisons for Local Senates (October 2016)
Elevate the CTE Faculty Voice (February 2021)

Senator Lukas made a motion to move this item to action as based on the overwhelming response she received in support of the CTE position. Seconded. Senators highlighted concerns regarding non-credit, and opposition and support voiced by faculty to senators.

The motion passed with 23 yes votes, 1 no vote, 2 abstentions, 2 absent.

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

Discussion continued:

- Could the job description be revised if the available funding is not sufficient to support all listed responsibilities?
 - The description could be sent back to the working group for adjustments if necessary.
- Concerning the funding source, CTE funding is mentioned, it is unclear how it would be allocated.
- Many of the listed duties resemble tasks already performed by existing faculty in fields.
- Suggestion that resources might be directed toward additional faculty, classified staff, or lab assistants.
- This would provide a formal faculty voice in CTE program operations, which is currently limited.
- Could strengthen faculty input and communication within career education programs.
- There is a need for coordination; the role should include noncredit programs and the development of pathways between noncredit and credit courses, aligning with the California Adult Education Program's three-year plan.
- Highlighted how position could help advance creation of pathways between non-credit and credit, as well as support goals and needs specific to increasing strategic enrollment goals.

Time expired on the issue with additional speakers still in the queue (Senators Persons and Melvin).

The Chair thanked the body and highlighted that the topic would be brought back at the April 1 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT 5:00 p.m.