



# ACADEMIC SENATE

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

## MEETING MINUTES

DATE: November 16th, 2022  
 TIME: 3:15 p.m.  
 LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini  
 Senate Chambers  
 Petaluma, 628 Call Bldg.  
 ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808  
<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/95846273808>

### PRESENT

M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan, S. Avasthi, B. Barajas, V. Bertsch, J. Bush, J. Carlin-Goldberg, S. Cavales Doolan, A. Donegan, W. Downey, J. Fassler, T. Jacobson, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, G. Morre, M. Ohkubo, A. Oliver, P. Ozbirinci, N. Persons, E. Schmidt, H. Skoonberg, N. Slovak, J. Stover, P. Usina

**ABSENT** G. Garcia (Proxy Barajas), T. Johnson (Proxy Aspinall)

**GUESTS** None

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President N. Persons. The Land Acknowledgement Statement was read by Senator V. Bertsch.

**OPEN FORUM** None

### MINUTES

Senator P. Usina moved to approve the November 2, 2022 minutes, which was seconded. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes as amended with 25 yes votes and 1 no vote as follows:

- |                          |                               |                    |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| M. Anderman – yes        | W. Downey – yes               | M. Ohkubo – yes    |
| L. Aspinall – yes        | J. Fassler – yes              | A. Oliver – yes    |
| A. Atilgan – yes         | G. Garcia (proxy Barajas) –   | P. Ozbirinci – yes |
| S. Avasthi – yes         | yes                           | E. Schmidt – yes   |
| B. Barajas – yes         | T. Jacobson – yes             | H. Skoonberg – yes |
| V. Bertsch – yes         | T. Johnson (proxy Aspinall) – | N. Slovak – yes    |
| J. Bush – yes            | yes                           | J. Stover – yes    |
| J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes | L. Larsen – yes               | P. Usina – yes     |
| S. Cavales Doolan – yes  | D. Lemmer – yes               |                    |
| A. Donegan – yes         | G. Morre – no                 |                    |

### ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

President Persons informed the body of the rules to adjust an Agenda and stated that it would require a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote of the body to pass.

Senator Ohkubo motioned to adjust the agenda by moving the first (urgent) discussion item to action, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed with 26 Yes votes, thus adjusting the agenda.

### REPORTS

#### 1. President’s Report – N. Persons

President Persons reported out on several current issues, including, but not limited to: a hybrid November 17<sup>th</sup> Town Hall on the continued strategic planning effort; forthcoming Senate (2) and AFA (2) appointments to the Screening and Interviewing Committee (SIC) for the position of Superintendent President, with potential collaboration; update on the Enrollment Management Workgroup as they continue to review submissions from domain group leaders; highlights from

the ASCCC Plenary (see notes for more detail); follow up meetings with Cabinet and others in support of recent Senate Guided Pathways motions; and College Council's mapping exercises designed to renew and review current shared governance structures, communities and finalization of committees survey, which will be sent out shortly.

[Read President Person's Full Report here](#)

[Read President Persons' Notes from Fall 2022 ASCCC Plenary here](#)

## 2. ZTC Grant Program - J. Carlin-Goldberg

Senator Goldberg presented on the features and timelines for the ZTC Grant Program Zero Textbook Program; noted SRJC is in Phase One and was awarded a \$20,000 grant for a planning phase; mentioned Phase Two was only for those with active programs already; mentioned that Phase Three is competitive and awards up to \$180,000 for implementation; reported that ZTC programs need to be sustainable, make use of existing resources, and have been successfully launched at other CCCs; pointed out that studies have shown that free materials support students' improved success, enrollment, and retention; and mentioned a planning workgroup is being formed.

[Review J. Carlin-Goldberg's "The Zero Textbook Cost \(ZTC\) Program" Presentation Here](#)

[Read "Zero Textbook Cost \(ZTC\) Program Overview: What we think we know ASCCC OERI September 26, 2022" Document Here](#)

CONSENT                      None

## ACTION

1. Alignment of Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) Election Cycle\* (URGENT). *The current expanded ASEC members' (At-large, Associate, and Equity) terms are set to expire at the end of the Fall 2022 semester, while elections for all other positions are held in spring per our bylaws. How shall we address this gap? Shall the AS hold a special election this semester to address the need to fill this gap, or extend the pilot positions 1 semester to synchronize all ASEC elections in spring?*

Senators expressed favor and support for extending the current pilot phase and positions, set to expire this Fall 2022 semester, for an additional semester and thru Spring 2023 to align with the Spring Election Cycle; and inquired as to whether the current Senators serving in the new roles wished to continue, with those Senators confirming yes, they did in fact wish to continue serving.

Senator Stover made a motion to extend the pilot positions one semester to synchronize all the EC elections in the spring 2023, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed with 26 yes votes.

A Senator requested assurance that this would be voted on in the spring, and Secretary Stover clarified the rules for election are included in the Bylaws and require Spring elections.

## DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Accreditation Workgroup Proposal [M. Collier, K. Kinahan Presenters]. *What shall be the Academic Senate's recommendation to the district regarding the work group's proposed actions to bring SRJC into compliance with the ACCJC Accreditation Requirements?*

[Faculty Accreditation Work Group SLO Recommendation](#)

Presenter M. Collier read the three recommendations on behalf of the SLO workgroup:

- 1) SLO faculty workgroup recommends that regular assessment be defined as all SLO be assessed at least every two years.

- 2) The SLO Faculty work group suggests that courses must have updated SLO assessments as a pre-requisite for course review, by the Curriculum Review Committee.
- 3) The workgroup recommends that all the SLO assessments be disaggregated by the demographic groups that are identified in SRJC's student equity Plan 2.0 and the annual intergraded post-secondary education system report known as IPADS. This would not preclude individual faculty or instructional departments from also choosing to analyze SLO assessment data that is disaggregated by additional student sub-populations or demographic groups to optimize the SLO achievement, as long as those core subsets are met.

President Persons indicated that the Senate's role is to make a recommendation, either one by one or all together, and forward to the district, and reminded the body that this is about curriculum, the number one item on the 10+1.

Presenter K. Kinahan discussed that the workgroup did a lot of research in developing the recommendations and wished to hear input from the Senate.

Senators provided feedback, asked if there is an easier way forward for SLO's that are being updated to be revised if the data is difficult to disaggregate; sought clarifications on the process and faculty responsibilities as specific to reporting SLO by student ID # and how the department would engage in the disaggregation of data; expressed support for the recommendations and asked about other CCCs processes and similarities; mentioned that ACCJC is requiring this type of SLO assessment from us; explained that there is already more data on some populations available than is being requested; asked if any allowances were being made in recommendation #1 specific to courses not offered due to regular rotation cycles (was answered it could be noted in such a case); expressed concern regarding a two-year cycle, especially for courses not offered during that time; noted that recommendation #2 could be problematic for updating courses if the courses are not offered frequently and recommended some flexibility therein (it was assured that this issue was noted and accounted for); recommended that the assessment be offered every 4 semesters rather than 2 years; and suggested developing two plans, one of which would be specific for courses not consistently offered.

Time expired on the discussion item, and Senator Ohkubo motioned to extend for 10 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senators expressed concern regarding two year assessment cycles; reminded the body that the number of department specific SLOs varies greatly and could be a significant workload change for some departments; stated that Recommendation #2 would need to be reviewed by and voted on first by CRC; discussed potential CRC-related problems as not yet identified; noted some associate faculty would be assisting with the SLO assessment but that contract faculty are specifically assigned the responsibility of that work; assured the body that workload concerns are of the utmost importance and are being discussed; reminded one another that SLO is not an "extra" workload but a curriculum matter and part of the job to make sure teaching is as effective as possible; noted that that if the task were completed regularly, it would not feel as burdensome; and that the decision for a two-year cycle was determined based on research and was consistent with other CCCs.

Time expired again, and Senator Jacobson made a motion to extend the time for three more minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senators expressed the need for a cultural change in relation to SLO assessment; stated that associate faculty who teach non-credit classes and adjunct faculty should also be involved in assessing SLO; and noted that multi-lingual needs should be taken into consider when completing SLOs so they are more inclusive.

Senator Aspinall made a motion to move this item to Action for the next meeting, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed with 26 yes votes.

2. Preparatory Discussion of 4.3.2P for Faculty Hiring Procedure Workgroup. *What shall be the Academic Senate's input and guidance to the workgroup preparing a draft revision of the remaining portions of 4.3.2P: Faculty Hiring Procedure?*

#### 4.3.2P Cross Walk of 2018 Reopened Procedure with Current Approved Revisions

President Persons started by announcing the appointments of Senators Ohkubo, Donegan and Carlin-Goldberg to the Faculty Hiring Procedure Workgroup (FHPW).

Senators asked the FHPW to keep in mind that there are varying number of faculty (contract vs. associate) in each department, and to recognize that requiring six faculty per committee may not work for everyone and that flexibility was important; asked for both an equal number of faculty to non-faculty, and more faculty than non-faculty as reflecting discipline expertise, was important; brought up that the Senate is a resource and can help provide feedback; reminded one another to refer to past minutes and the values statement when considering past discussions and Senate support on the topic since 2019; suggested that as the FHPW completes a section, to bring the section back to the body for discussion and not wait until all sections were complete; asked to consider that Deans not be required to be on all hiring committees; asked for neurodivergent considerations to be brought into the procedures; and asked for clarification on the policies being considered and the support documents available.

President Persons and Vice President Ohkubo clarified that Board has already incorporated the value statement to Policy 4.3.2, and the body is to discuss procedures; mentioned the Senate is discussing revising the four sections that have not yet been addressed by the Senate since the topic had been taken up again; answered questions about the support document and its contents and origins; noted that anything already approved by the Senate in most recent conversations would have to be reopened with a motion to reconsider; and mentioned that as the Senate is continuing to discuss the procedures, in the meantime Human Resources continues to operate from existing board procedures.

Before closing the discussion to be brought back at the next meeting, a Senator asked that if additional members are considered for hiring committees in the procedures, that it be specifically determined if they are voting or non-voting members before hiring committee activities commence.

3. Student Equity Plan 2.0 [S. Cavales-Doolan and M. Long, Presenters]. *What shall be the Academic Senate's input regarding the Student Equity Plan 2.0 (barriers, outcomes, and action)?*

#### SEP 2.0 Presentation

Senator Cavales Doolan provided an overview of the planned update for the Student Equity Plan, or SEP 2.0, noting it covers the next three year period (2022—25); shifts away from individual activities and builds towards systemic change in eliminating barriers and seeking to be race conscious; identifies five outcome areas specific to enrollment, completion, retention, and transfer (see slide deck for specifics); highlighted their collaborative process which included members from across the college and included a survey that helped identify a range of barriers students face; identified Disproportionately Impacted (DI) Students (2% off from average), including First Generation, Males, Latinx, and Foster Youth; decided to specifically target First Generation, who cross over all other DI populations; set the goal to eliminate completion gaps and introduce cohort-based models; mentioned results are not likely observable for three years due to longitude nature of work; laid out plan of action – “Goal → Impediment → Ideal → Sample Action Steps” – for each of the goals; and following the Senate report, indicated they are also reporting to invested constituencies across the college before going before the Board on December 13, 2022.

President Persons indicated that the Senate's role is to endorse the SEP 2.0, should they choose to do so.

Senator Carlin-Goldberg motioned to move this discussion item to action for the next meeting, which was seconded.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed with 26 Yes votes.

<b>INFORMATION</b>	None
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	5:03 p.m.