



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

November 19, 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, A. Atilgan Relyea (Petaluma), S. Avasthi (Remote), L. Branen-Ahumada, K. Bunas, J. Bush, J. Davis, K. Fortunati, K. Frindell Teuscher, V. Hamilton (Petaluma), T. Jacobson, J. Kremer, D. Lemmer, L. D. Lukas, S. McGregor-Gordon, T. Melvin, J. Nieto, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, M. Papa, N. Perrone (Petaluma), N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), E. Schmidt, I. Tircuit

ABSENT G. Garcia (proxy V. Hamilton)

GUESTS A. Foster

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 M. Papa.
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

K. Frindell-Teuscher: The Biological Sciences faculty urged support for the AB 1705 resolution, arguing that placing all students directly into transfer-level Math has reduced equity for STEM students. They reported that many students struggle or repeatedly fail these courses, leaving them discouraged or underprepared for advanced STEM work. Restoring optional pre-transfer-level Math classes, including late-start "off-ramps," would better build skills, confidence, and access to STEM pathways.

J. Fassler: Many Chemistry students lack essential Math preparation but could not access foundational courses under AB 1705. Using local achievement data, it was noted that readiness for college-level Math varies across student groups. He asked the Senate to support the resolution, so students would have the option to take additional Math preparation when needed.

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

MINUTES

1. [Minutes of October 29, 2025](#) N. Persons moved to approve the minutes of October 29, 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 (Proxy Hamilton)	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver	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	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

2. [Minutes of November 5, 2025](#) N. Persons moved to approve the minutes of October 1, 2025. Seconded. The motion passed with 23 yes votes and 4 abstentions.

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	yes
S. Avasthi	abstain	T. Jacobson	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Kremer	abstain	N. Perrone	yes
K. Bunas	yes	D. Lemmer	yes	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	abstain	D. Lukas	yes	S. Rosen	yes
J. Davis	yes	S. McGregor-Gordon	yes	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Fortunati	abstain	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA Any Senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion. None

REPORTS None

CONSENT Treated collectively as one Action item. Any Senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion. None

ACTION

1. **What recommendations does the Academic Senate have regarding curriculum needs specific to Generative Artificial Intelligence? The updated support document entitled *General Guidance to help Disciplines Navigate AI Use* highlights Senators' previously discussed ideas from our ~~September 17th~~ and ~~October 1st~~ meetings as well as the action taken on November 5th.**

Senator Perrone made a motion for the Academic Senate to send a list of items to the Generative AI Task Force. Seconded.

- Some members asked what the task force would do with the list and whether the Senate should provide specific direction.
- A Senator explained the list would be brought to a faculty teaching-and-learning group within the Generative AI task force for follow-up.
- It was noted the list was not exhaustive and could be expanded later.
- The absence of environmental impact from the list was brought up, and it was clarified that the task force already had this issue on its agenda.
- Clarification was sought on whether the task force would create policies, workshops, or other outputs; it was stated this would be determined once the task force met, unless the Senate amended the motion to direct the work.
- Questions were raised about how the Senate would receive updates, and it was stated that any outcomes from the task force regarding the 10+1 would return to the Senate for review.
- The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

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	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	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

2. **Is the body in support of creating a resolution re: AB1705 Reform?** Should the body vote in support of this item, [the practices and guidelines for forming a Senate workgroup](#) can be implemented in support of resolution development.

- J. Smotherman provided an [overview of local data](#) related to AB 705 and AB 1705, focusing on new students.
- Data show increases in first-year enrollment and success in transfer-level Math and English after AB 705/1705, including Math enrollment rising from 13% to 31%.
- Policy shifts—removing placement tests, using self-guided placement, and preventing repetition of previously completed coursework—created a fundamentally different structure that complicates direct comparison with pre-legislation years.
- Research found no evidence that pre-transfer-level coursework improved later outcomes; disaggregated data show no single demographic predicts success, and general academic support remains beneficial.

Discussion points:

- While completing pre-transfer-level courses did not ensure success in transfer-level classes, shorter and optional preparatory pathways could still support students' readiness for transfer-level Math and English.
- The Math department wants to avoid long remedial pathways and noted that some students who may need a single pre-transfer course are not being retained.

Senator Melvin made a motion to approve the AB 1705 resolution as written. Seconded.

Discussion on the motion:

- It was clarified that the agenda item focused on forming a work group to draft a resolution, not adopting it directly, and it was clarified that Senators may make independent motions on the overall item topic.
- Some students succeed with direct transfer-level placement, while others need preparatory Math, and some disengage when options are limited.
- Immediate transfer-level English may not align with language learners' developmental needs, and current rules do not distinguish ESL from native speakers.
- Concerns included tracking students, degree-applicable course changes, and challenges with a uniform placement approach.

Motion to extend time by 6 minutes. Seconded. No opposition, so the motion passed.

Discussion on the motion continued:

- The resolution contains two main resolves: offering students the option to take standalone pre-transfer courses and restoring decision-making authority to students and faculty experts.
- Community Colleges are the primary institutions providing these courses, raising concern about student access if not offered.
- Data from past years may not fully capture students who drop out early or need additional support.
- Providing pre-transfer options aligns with the college's role in supporting diverse learners and offering pathways to higher education.
- Concerns were raised about the resolution addressing only state-level action, missing potential District-level initiatives, and the resolution template would pass a general framework rather than detailed local directives.
- Recent data indicate increases in students not passing Math and English courses, highlighting the need to consider support for these students.
- Time ran out on the issue without the motion being repeated by the chair, and the motion, as still belonging to Senator Melvin, will be brought back next meeting.

3. [AP7120A: Options for Student Involvement, Outside Faculty Member & Ranking](#) – M. Ohkubo, presenter (20 min). [Link to Current AP7120A Draft](#) and [Link to 4.3.2P document approved by Academic Senate in 2020](#).

- The item was introduced and the body was reminded of the three areas: student involvement, outside faculty member, and ranking, and that Vice President of Human Resources, A. Dunphy was available during the discussion for any clarification.

Motion made by Senator Lukas to approve ranking option number 2, ranking as an option. Seconded. 25 yes votes, 2 no votes. Motion passed.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	no	G. Garcia (Proxy Hamilton)	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver	yes
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	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	yes

Senator Persons made a motion for student involvement, to adopt option 1- mandatory student on interview committee as a voting member. 13 yes, 14 no votes. Motion failed.

M. Anderman	no	K. Frindell-Teuscher	no	J. Nieto	no
L. Aspinall	yes	G. Garcia (Proxy Hamilton)	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver	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	no	N. Persons	yes
J. Bush	yes	D. Lukas	no	S. Rosen	no
J. Davis	no	S. McGregor-Gordon	no	E. Schmidt	no
K. Fortunati	yes	T. Melvin	no	I. Tircuit	no

Senator Aspinall made a motion to include a mandatory student interaction demonstration with optional student on the hiring committee. Seconded.

- Mandatory student interaction demonstrations allow candidates to engage with students in teaching or counseling scenarios; feedback can be collected via surveys.
- Some comments supported mandatory demonstrations for insight into candidate-student interaction; others preferred department-level flexibility.
- Clarifications provided by A. Dunphy: EEO monitors and committee chairs oversee demonstrations, with survey feedback shared anonymously with committees.
- Suggestions made to separate voting on student interaction demonstrations and student committee participation to allow more flexibility.

Senator Aspinall made a motion to withdraw her motion. Seconded. 17 yes, 10 no. 2/3rd majority vote needed. Motion was stated as passing (**did not meet 2/3rd majority needed**).

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

Discussion continued:

- Statement made supporting option 3 as aligning with the “2023 Senate compromise” and recommended that the entire hiring committee be present during teaching demonstrations, as practiced in their department.

Senator Bush made a motion to have mandatory student interaction demonstration as part of student involvement. Seconded. Vote was never taken on this motion.

- ***It was brought up that the previous motion to withdraw the motion to include a mandatory student interaction demonstration with optional student on the hiring committee did not pass because it did not pass by 2/3 vote.***

Motion by Senator Tircuit to extend time by 5 minutes was seconded. No opposition. Motion passed.

- A Senator noted they will vote no on the current motion and requested the authors revise the options document to include more options for clarity and group consensus.

A vote was taken on the original motion that failed the vote to be withdrawn. The motion was to include a mandatory student interaction demonstration with optional student on the hiring committee. 12 yes votes. 15 no votes. Motion failed.

M. Anderman	yes	K. Frindell-Teuscher	yes	J. Nieto	yes
L. Aspinall	no	G. Garcia (Proxy Hamilton)	no	M. Ohkubo	no
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	A. Oliver	yes
S. Avasthi	no	T. Jacobson	no	M. Papa	no
L. Brannen-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	no	T. Melvin	yes	I. Tircuit	no

BREAK

Senator Persons moved to introduce the time-sensitive information item on the Curriculum Writer's Handbook next in the agenda. Seconded. 27 unanimous yes votes. Motion passed.

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

INFORMATION

1. [CRC-approved Curriculum Writer's Handbook Review](#). A. Foster. A highlight of the major changes in the handbook, which include a new Noncredit Section, a new Conflict Discipline/Overlap process, new definitions, new appendices, and more.
 - CRC updated the Curriculum Writer's Handbook over 12–18 months; updates needed about every 6 months.
 - Workflow updates are pending system transition.
 - Unit value changes require rationale from faculty, chair, and dean.
 - New course development and discipline overlap processes clarified with documented communication, timelines, and ad hoc committee review.
 - Numbering section updated for Common Course Numbering, non-credit, and work experience courses.
 - Program/certificate workflow updated; non-credit courses formalized.
 - Clarified comparables for UC/CSU courses and credit for prior learning process.
 - Glossary updated; Appendix D revised; new appendices added for overlap conflicts.

- CSU-only courses allowed while awaiting UC approval, with guidance available.

Discussion:

- Question about courses previously declined or appealed before the new handbook. Departments can resubmit previously declined courses under the new review process once the handbook is approved.
- The updated handbook will return on the consent agenda at the next meeting.
- President Stover acknowledged A. Foster for her contributions and leadership of the Curriculum Review Committee.

ADJOURNMENT 5:00 p.m.

Agendized Items Not Addressed (time expired)

From the Action Agenda

4. *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? (10 min)*
[The Mira Costa Calendar Project](#) serves as model for how one District moved from 18 weeks to 16 weeks.

From the Discussion Agenda

1. *[A Discussion on SRJC Foundation's five year \(2025—30\) Philanthropic Plan](#). The Senate is being asked to provide answers to the following question prompts (10 min):*
 - *What are the top two to three (2–3) priorities [in the Senate's 10+1 purview](#) that are most critical to advancing [Santa Rosa Junior College's 2025—30 Strategic Plan](#)?*
 - *Where do you see the biggest opportunities to impact student success in the next three to five (3–5) years?*
 - *What types of initiatives in the Senate's area/purview could philanthropy uniquely advance?*

[LINK TO ZOOM RECORDING](#)

[LINK TO MEETING TRANSCRIPT](#)