

## **MEETING MINUTES**

DATE: November 30th, 2022

TIME: 3:15 p.m.

LOCATION: Santa Rosa, 4638 Bertolini

> Senate Chambers Petaluma, 628 Call Bldg.

958 4627 3808 ZOOM ID:

A. Oliver - yes

P. Ozbirinci – yes

E. Schmidt - yes

N. Slovak – yes

J. Stover - yes

yes

H. Skoonberg – yes

P. Usina (proxy Avasthi) -

https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/95846273808

### **PRESENT**

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

**ABSENT** B. Barajas (proxy Garcia), J. Bush (proxy Jacobson), W. Downey (proxy Schmidt), J.

Fassler, P. Usina (partial) (proxy Avasthi)

Dr. Marina Aminy, California Virtual College (CVC); Merrill Collier, VPAA Robert GUESTS

Holcomb, Kim Kinahan,

### 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 H. Skoonberg.

### **OPEN FORUM**

Senator Skoonberg read a statement on behalf of AFA President S. Martin to clarify contractual obligations regarding SLO assessments are one of many options for contract faculty service.

### Read Sean Martin's full statement here

Senator Donegan read a statement about procedures for selecting representatives from the Academic Senate to presidential search committees in which she recommended a full Senate vote during a closed session.

### Read Senator Donegan's full statement here

### **MINUTES**

Senator J. Carlin-Goldberg motioned to approve the November 16, 2022, minutes, which was seconded. A roll call vote was called, and Senators adopted the minutes with 24 yes votes, 1 abstain, and 1 absence as follows:

M. Anderman – ves L. Aspinall – yes

A. Atilgan – yes

S. Avasthi – yes B. Barajas (proxy Garcia) -

yes

V. Bertsch – yes

J. Bush (proxy Jacobson) -

yes

**REPORTS** 

J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes

S. Cavales Doolan - yes

A. Donegan – yes

W. Downey (proxy Schmidt)

ves

J. Fassler – absent

G. Garcia – yes

T. Jacobson – yes

T. Johnson – abstain

L. Larsen – yes

D. Lemmer - yes

G. Morre – yes

M. Ohkubo - yes

None

### ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

1. President's Report – N. Persons

President Persons reported out on several current issues, including, but not limited to: a

Planning and Budget Council meeting and a webinar on the Brown Act update regarding AB 2449 (see report for full detail); the upcoming formation of a multi-constituent workgroup considering future structures for Guided Pathways work; attendance at a recent Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) meeting to understand the CRC-related concerns and purview as specific to current events; Strategic Planning Town Hall related activities and their focus on Academic Quality, Student Success & Support, Responsiveness to our Community, and Campus Climate and Culture; College Council updates and a forthcoming committee survey; and news of the Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) choice of George Sellu and Nancy Persons to serve on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee.

## Read President Person's Full Report here

2. Student Government Association (SGA) Report – SGA President A. Tillman

SGA President A. Tillman provided an overview on Fall activities, including but not limited to: four officer vacancies filled; VP of Sustainability purchased reusable cups for students as gifts; participating on the Hiring Committees for Interim of VP of Student Services, Director of Residential Life, Interim Dean of Students, and others; Welcome Week activities (September); Starry Night & Club Advisory Training; Club Days (September, October and November) on SR and PET campuses; participation in Southwest Center Welcome Day; compost bin project placement; funding for Restorative Justice projects; upcoming office hours at the Public Safety and Training Center on Dec 7<sup>th</sup> 12 pm – 2 pm; collaboration in suicide prevention event; roundtable for housing branding; and many other activities including promotions and marketing events on campus, multiple additional hiring committees, and the appointment of over 30 students to shared Government positions. The full report and current issues being discussed in SGA can also be reviewed in the full report below.

# Read A. Tillman's Full Report here

# CONSENT

None

### **ACTION**

1. Faculty Accreditation Workgroup Proposal. 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?

President Persons recommended to the body that should a motion be made, that they could be offered one at a time.

Senators reiterated that difficulty departments staffed primarily by associate, and not contract, faculty face when assessing SLOs every two years and the potentially heavy workload involved; questioned why the cycle of review was being proposed to change from every six years to every two years; spoke to recommendation #2 and expressed reluctance to put CRC in the "policing" role; recommended an incentivizing approach versus a punitive approach; asked for a team to help support departments in completing SLO assessments; suggested that it is an added burden for the AAs that support the CRC; spoke to recommendation #1 and suggested one SLO from one course be conducted each semester; spoke of SLOs as a direct part of their grading process that allows for more reflection and is not an increased burden; stated that as per the AFA open forum statement, SLOs are "required but not required"; reminded the body that SLO assessment is a mandated requirement for accreditation; suggested a three-year cycle to help keep faculty in compliance and make SLO assessment a part of the process of grading and teaching and learning; suggested if the course SLOs are not completed to possibly no longer offer the course until the SLO's are updated; and asked for clarification of recommendation #1 and what support or help would be offered for increased workload and in relation to associate faculty needs.

Presenters Merrill Collier & Dr. Robert Holcomb clarified that Associate Faculty can assist in SLO assessments and that they are working with AFA to negotiate this related need.

Senators stated that assessments across all levels of the institution are part of best practices, and the issue is "how" to accomplish this; asked about what new software would help us reach these goals; agreed establishing an intervention team and possibly the extension of the 2-year time frame; and concerns related to the requirements of assessment as related to various time frames and factors. Time expired on the topic.

Senator Skoonberg motioned to extend time for 8 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senators expressed there is a lot of opportunity to make SLOs more meaningful; recommended that when you submit grading you should be able to submit your SLOs; and asked about having grading and SLO assessment integrated in the grading process.

Dr. Holcomb spoke about new software they are exploring as related to Canvas and SRJC's current software environment; and are looking for integrated and streamlined options.

A Senator noted that there was extensive discussion and not clear agreement on recommendations #1 & 2; noted being in favor of SLOs and committed to the accreditation process; and had not heard any concern or opposition or even discussion on item #3.

Senator Stover motioned to adopt recommendation #3 as is stated in the Faculty Workgroup Recommendations, which was seconded.

President Persons reminded the body that comments are to be related to the above motion. Senators discussed that they felt that recommendation #3 was not discussed thoroughly enough. Time expired again.

Senator Stover motioned to extend time for 10 minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senator Stover clarified his reason for making the motion; noted that when President Persons opened the discussion, she specified that we were talking about all the recommendations, and that he had not heard any opposition to Recommendation #3, which was straight forward and non-controversial.

Senators discussed being in favor of assessments as part of the current grading technology/system; noted that there is a difference between general curriculum review and assessing students to see if they met the objectives as part of the grading process and suggested possibly dividing this into two different categories; brought up that some instructors do not use Canvas, and asked how that would work if Canvas is going to be used for SLO assessments; noted that the point of SLO assessments is to help the faculty help students meet the curriculum goals and help instructors improve and change; discussed that some ESL students do not use Canvas; discussed how software would disaggregate the data rather than falling on faculty; asked if Student Equity Plan 2.0 was finalized, and if not should recommendation #3 be passed at this time.

Points of clarification offered included the SEP 2.0 was in its final form; 1<sup>st</sup> generation students were identified as the DI students to be targeted for support, and that SLO assessments could be made in Canvas as long as grades were posted in Canvas.

Senator Aspinall called for the question, the vote was called, and the motion passed unanimously with 25 yes votes.

## Faculty Accreditation Work Group SLO Recommendation

The three recommendations 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, if those core subsets are met.
- 2. Student Equity Plan 2.0. What shall be the Academic Senate's input regarding the Student Equity Plan 2.0 (barriers, outcomes, and action)?

Senator Aspinall motioned for the Academic Senate to endorse the Student Equity Plan 2.0, which was seconded.

Senators discussed adding the language about non-transferable ESL math courses, which is an important support tool for first generation; stated on the document that there are provisions for ESL and discussed integrating students in every class; clarified there is more than what is in the PowerPoint and there are support services included in the totality of the report; stated that completion of Math and English in one year needs more time because many of the students are part time; clarified these categories come from the Chancellors office; and noted that one year completion is a difficult time frame for most students.

Senator Aspinall called for the vote, the vote was taken, and the motion passed with 24 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 absence as follows:

# SEP 2.0 Presentation

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

## DISCUSSION

1. CVC MEMBERSHIP – L. Beach. What shall the Academic Senate's recommendation be reading SRJC's participation in the CVC Online Course Exchange?

President Persons thanked L. Beach for the presentation video she prepared in advance for the Senate and asked the body if they were satisfied with the recorded video in place of an in-person review now, which the Senate was.

L. Beach stated by thanking the body for their efforts over the last couple of years; introduced CVC Acting Executive Director Dr. Marina Aminy who was attending via Zoom and available to answer questions; mentioned that the overarching goal was provide students with more class options online, something students were already doing; support students who want to complete some coursework through other CCCs, which again was already happening and already being recommended by counselors; reported that CVC has expanded to approximately 80 home colleges & 23 teaching colleges to date; noted that enrollment is limited to "home students" first and opened to other (non-SRJC) students after home college registration processes are completed; reviewed enrollment and registration processes as related to whether a college is a home or teaching college; and discussed when enrollment would be "instantaneous" versus more involved via cvc(dot)edu.

During the discussion Dr. Aminy offered these clarifications in the chat feature of the Zoom:

- Dr. Marina Aminy, California Virtual Campus to Everyone (4:51 PM): You got that right, Lisa. Starting Jan. 1 only colleges with that Course Finder API technology will have their courses appear in searches.
- @TARA: Courses will become available on the Exchange when the college tells us to make it available (including non-Credit). CVC does not determine availability, the college does.

Senators discussed questions specific to how data is being collected and what number of students coming in to thru CVC.edu we might expect and what classes they might take; asked questions about the number of classes student would be allowed to take and where; received clarifications on when students would have to fill out CCC Apply (when a college is not a "home" college); heard how becoming a "home" college would streamline the enrollment process for students; supported allowing students more opportunities to meet their educational goals via CVC; discussed that this is happening with students now. Senator Johnson is in support of SRJC becoming a home and teaching college; and asked that for students with accommodations if that information could just be transferred from SRJC to another CCC when they enroll.

Dr. Aminy stated that for students with disabilities, information on their home accommodations will not be transferred, and those accommodations will have to be requested via the teaching college in which they enroll and follow their processes.

Senators discussed the "push to online reality" and need to prepare for the when another pandemic hits; were assured there is priority registration for SRJC students first; asked that enrollment goals not come at the expense of underserved students; heard that if specific technological requirements are necessary to show a live seat count in the CVC; heard that that starting Jan 1 only colleges with the course finder technology will have their courses appear in searches; heard that courses will become available on the exchange when a college tells CVC to make them available (including non-credit); were reassured that CVC does not determine availability, the college does; heard that students need to have 6 units at their home college in order to use the exchange; heard that 80% of students are enrolling in one course per term and are often being referred directly back to their own college; supported removing barriers and support students' degree and transfer goals in a timely manner; and supported providing the greatest amount of choice. Time expired on the topic.

Senator Stover motioned to extend time by three minutes, which was seconded and not opposed.

Senator Aspinall asked for clarification regarding a possible move to action, and whether individual or all recommendations would be moved to action, and President Persons clarified motions can take whatever the Senator making the motion so chooses.

A Senator expressed concern regarding as to whether science classes and some nursing courses would be accepted if they are only being taken online, and Dr. Aminy stressed the importance of seeking the guidance of an academic counselor when researching and accounting for the transferability of courses taken.

A Senator asked the existential questions as to who and what we are as a college with regards to online and face to face course offerings; would like less ambiguity regarding SRJC's direction as an educational institution; expressed concern regarding the push to increase online and decrease in face-to-face teaching; and requested more conversations and discussions around these questions.

Senator Stover motioned that the CVC discussion item be moved to action, which was seconded.

The vote was taken, and the motion passed with 20 yes votes, 5 no votes, and 1 absence as follows:

M. Anderman – yes S. Cavales Doolan - no L. Aspinall – yes A. Donegan – no A. Atilgan – yes W. Downey (Proxy S. Avasthi – yes Schmidt) - no B. Barajas (proxy J. Fassler – yes G. Garcia – yes Garcia) - ves V. Bertsch – ves T. Jacobson – ves J. Bush (proxy T. Johnson – yes Jacobson) – ves L. Larsen – yes J. Carlin-Goldberg – yes D. Lemmer – yes

G. Morre – no
M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver – yes
P. Ozbirinci – yes
E. Schmidt – no
H. Skoonberg – yes
N. Slovak – no
J. Stover – yes

P. Usina (proxy Avasthi)

– yes

CVC Exchange Presentation Video

**CVC Exchange Slides** 

**INFORMATION** In the que for the next meeting are Senators Donegan and Johnson.

ADJOURNMENT 5:00 p.m.