



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

MEETING MINUTES

April 16th, 2025, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Bertolini Senate Chambers,
Room 4638

Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808 / Click [here](#) to start Zoom

PRESENT M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Avasthi, J. Davis, K. Frindell Teuscher, G. Garcia, T. Jacobson, T. Johnson, J. Kremer, L. Larsen, D. Lemmer, L. D. Lukas, A. Martin, S. McGregor-Gordon, G. Morre, N. Perrone, N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), T. Ruiz, E. Schmidt, N. Slovak, J. Stover, I. Tircuit, A. Yu (Petaluma)

ABSENT W. Downey, M. Papa (proxy A. Martin), P. Usina (proxy N. Persons)

GUESTS J. Smotherman, R. Holcomb

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

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT Land acknowledgement statement was read by Senator Aspinall.

OPEN FORUM

1. **A. Atilgan Relyea:** Statement regarding GenAI training on campus with Adult Ed, EMLS faculty and others. Asked for clarity re: GenAI training and tools. She realized most faculty were not aware of the Senate's discussion around GenAI policy, thus her request is to have those communications distributed amongst departments.
2. **S. Whyly:** Statement about concern for Strategic Plan development, that items surfaced during faculty focus groups were left out of the current iteration. Hoped there'd be discussion on the matter during the Information Item, so that concerns from faculty can be addressed in good faith.
3. **E. Schmidt:** Statement ([full statement linked here](#)) regarding concern over the Strategic Action Plan Update report. Participated in faculty focus groups and recommendations from those groups aren't on the report. Specifics: facilitation of academic quality by decreasing class size & provision of funding for discipline-specific professional development opportunities for associate and contract faculty.
4. **M. Von der Porten:** Statement regarding AB 1705 issues on removal of Math and English remedial classes; Board had a special session to understand the elimination of remedial classes and next steps, but he wants to know more specific numbers and plan from SRJC.

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION None.

MINUTES Correction/Adoption.

Minutes of April 2nd, 2025

President Stover asked if there were any edits or corrections. Hearing none, Senator Persons made a motion to approve the Minutes from the last meeting, seconded. The [Minutes of April 2nd, 2025](#) were adopted with vote: 25 yes votes.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher – yes
G. Garcia – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
T. Johnson – yes

J. Kremer – yes
L. Larsen – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
A. Martin – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes
G. Morre – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes
M. Papa (proxy A. Martin) – yes

N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
T. Ruiz – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
N. Slovak – abstain
I. Tircuit – absent for vote
P. Usina (proxy N. Persons) – yes
A. Yu – yes

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA Any senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion.

Senator Lukas moved to move the Information Item agenda to before the break, seconded. President Stover asked if there was any opposition and, hearing none, confirmed the adjustment.

REPORTS

1. President's Report: President Stover:

- Announced a Special Session of the Academic Senate on May 21st devoted to Faculty Hiring.
- Asked the body to consider voting on the first Action Item, quickly resolving it.
- Introduced proposed votes developed by ASEC, incorporating Senate discussions and task force recommendations, for the Reapportionment Action Item.
- Announced, pending Board approval, the Academic Senate's administrative assistant will be full-time next year.
- Voiced appreciation and support toward easing the hardship of part-time work for associate faculty colleagues.
- Gave update re: status of elections: results in and At-Large Nominations live, officer elections on May 7th
- Gave update re: Artificial Intelligence Academic Integrity administrative procedure: district will be launching the (Senate-recommended) task force, which the Senate will refer work to.
- VPAA update: obligation of contract faculty for college service; thus, it isn't a viable option to consider increasing Associate representation on the Senate.

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

ACTION Items must come from the Discussion agenda of a previous meeting or be carried over from a previous Action agenda.

1. Senate Generative Artificial Intelligence Action Items

- **carry over sub-item 1b.** Does the Academic Senate wish to recommend the inclusion of a library department faculty representative as a key constituent anytime specific GenAI work and/or committees are formed? ([see p.3 and/or library's feedback](#))

Senators Persons began by summarizing the consideration with observations:

- In the past, this body has specified multiple disciplines be included in calls for faculty to serve on district groups (the District Educational Plan Work Group in September 2023 for example)
- Representatives of disciplines are included but do not halt the group's work if the requested discipline does not have a representative or they are absent

- It is valid for Library faculty to assert their discipline expertise, relevance to Generative AI work and surprised no other disciplines contacted their Senate representative to suggest inclusion in a group involved in this work

Senator Persons moved the Senate recommend that a library department faculty representative be included, when possible, as a member of the long-term multi-constituent task force on addressing Gen AI issues approved by the body at its March 5th, 2025, meeting, seconded. Discussion on the motion followed:

- Clarification whether 'library department faculty' includes associate faculty
 - Intentionally did not distinguish or define faculty right now; the District can decide when to add associate faculty when appropriate on an individual basis
- Clarification on the motion that it incorporated the recognition of concern when someone from a specific discipline recommended by the Senate can't be found to fill the position.
- Clarification if the motion passed it would be a formal recommendation from the Senate re: member composition of the District's forthcoming Gen AI taskforce. It would be recommended to College Council (which has Senate and AFA representation).

A call for the question was made and the vote was taken and the motion passed with 25 yes and 2 no votes.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher – yes
G. Garcia – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
T. Johnson – yes

J. Kremer – yes
L. Larsen – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
A. Martin – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes
G. Morre – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes
M. Papa (proxy A. Martin) – yes

N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
T. Ruiz – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
N. Slovak – no
I. Tircuit – no
P. Usina (proxy N. Persons) – yes
A. Yu – yes

2. Meeting the Five Year Senate Area Apportionment Cycle Requirement (overdue) as per [ARTICLE VIII, Section 5 of the bylaws](#): "Representation will be reviewed every five years by the Senate for apportionment reconsideration."

Senator Lukas made a motion to add associate faculty email addresses to contract faculty distribution lists for the purposes of dispersing Senator notes in each contract area, seconded. Discussion on the motion followed:

- Representation is confused amongst faculty, and this could be further confusing
- Each Area needs an email list of the actual constituents; it is the method to distribute ballots for elections
- There are no associate faculty in Areas 1-11, they are contract faculty areas by definition in the Bylaws, which also has confusing wording re: Areas 12 & 13.
- Suggestion to create email lists of associate faculty in their discipline areas
- Constitution and Bylaws future work (i.e. changes) could affect these definitions
- Shared end goal is needed to communicate with faculty in specific discipline area, regardless of associate or contract faculty, and the method doesn't have to be determined now
- Updating email distribution lists through Outlook at SRJC is a time-consuming and manual process
- Distribution lists are inaccurate; associate faculty in Lifelong Learning receive emails but Lifelong Learning isn't specified in the Areas of Representation.
- Others voiced concern for the motion's wording but supported the idea

A call for the question was made and the vote was taken and the motion unanimously failed.

Clarification of Robert's Rules: a Senator who makes a motion can withdraw the motion if they wish by asking the chair to call for unanimous consent to withdraw, which saves time spent voting it down.

Next, President Stover passed the gavel to Vice President Ohkubo to chair while he presented the first Information Item with Dr. Smotherman, Senior Director of the office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, Institutional Research (IERP).

INFORMATION

1. [Strategic Actions Plan Update](#) – J. Smotherman, J. Stover

J. Smotherman & J. Stover, co-chairs of the Strategic Action Planning Work Group presented their update, highlighting:

- Institutional planning and development are included in 10+1 as mutually agreed upon between the Academic Senate and the District; that process was agreed upon in Planning and Budget Council (PBC)
- Key performance indicators (KPIs) are the ways to judge Institutional effectiveness and success
- Extensive participation amongst faculty and staff throughout this process / representation in coordinating committee
- Process for developing Action Steps began in October 2024; the Template used for drafting Action Steps: *SRJC prioritizes [Initiative] by [Initiative Description] with [Action Step] that [Goal] and will provide [Indicator of Effective Outcome] by [Target].*
- Feedback from PBC, the Senate, and other constituency groups will be taken back to the Strategic Action Work Group, which will meet for the next four weeks to continue this work, which is currently in draft form.
- Fall semester survey responses produced consistent themes; the work group then identified the need for focus groups to provide additional information
- Anything brought forward that was being negotiated, or a Senate matter already in progress, was not included in an Action Step
- Clarification: class size is currently being negotiated by the Union which is why it wasn't included
- Indicators of effective outcomes and concern about the success matrix feedback will be taken to the Board
- The Action Steps presented do not contain everything that's been compiled and are not the final draft
- Incorporating feedback on the success metrics is still possible

Questions from constituents:

- How to isolate variables to effectively measure the enrollment increase metric
 - J. Smotherman answered that, in the Academic Quality subgroup of the Strategic Actions Work Group (entirely composed of faculty), the conversation consistently revolved around scheduling for student needs, class modality, and assessments of course demand. These needs are identified in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, which is why it is connected back to the Success Metric of 17,500 FTES.
- What is the connection between increased noncredit enrollments and student inspiration
 - J. Smotherman clarified the inspiration to prepare students for continuous learning connected to Lifelong Learning and noncredit, so making sure there is continuous growth in the noncredit area
- How does the quantitative metric of achieving 17,500 FTES prove that scheduling was successful, and that students felt they received excellent guidance from faculty, etc.

The item ran out of time and Vice President Ohkubo passed the gavel back to President Stover who introduced the next Information Item.

2. [Academic Affairs Update](#) – R. Holcomb

Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) R. Holcomb presented his report on the Academic Affairs Budgetary Reduction Plan and highlighted:

- Fall 2022: \$1.4 million structural deficit
- In subsequent years, through singular focus of identifying vacant positions, the deficit decreased
- Based on Academic Senate input, District's deficit reduction approach is more comprehensive this year
- Report recommends course of action that would bring the structural deficit down to \$225,000 by next year

Comments from Senators followed:

- The State of CA auditing report on the [50% law](#) was referenced; specifically, the data of change (%) in administrators vs. faculty salaries. Question from the Senator whether local data could be shared.
- Specifics were asked regarding organizational alignment; R. Holcomb stated this year there's a possibility of capturing additional savings that weren't finalized last year
- A senator applauded the net reduction trend shared in the update
- Another senator was excited to see the effort put forth to better SRJC administrative systems; others agreed they'd appreciate the processes and technological resources for paperwork routing to be more efficient, which is echoed by their classified colleagues

Time ran out on the item and President Stover announced the break.

BREAK – 5 minutes

DISCUSSION

1. [Proposed SLO Updated Rubric](#) – S. Avasthi & E. Schmidt

Does the Academic Senate recommend the adoption of the SLO Rubric Revision as proposed?

S. Avasthi shared that the use of a SLO Rubric, approved by the Senate in 2023, for three semesters hasn't worked well for faculty using formative assessment, thus the need for the update. SLO Coordinators came up with a rubric they feel will work better to capture all faculty needs. Instead of a binary rubric (yes or no) they added various categories of the students moving through the process. The update solves the confusion from data reflecting inaccuracies without a 'no submission of assignment' category.

Senator Johnson moved that the Proposed SLO Updated Rubric be moved to the Action Agenda at the next meeting, seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

2. **Senate Budget Overview and Management** – What is the will of the Senate in terms of overall management and fiscal sustainability of our (very small) budget? *Budgets of the past have supported limited engagement of Senators at statewide conferences, and fundraising efforts have been uneven. Questions have been raised by Senators regarding funding mechanisms and whether other CCC Academic Senates are funded (in part, in full) by their Districts? The other potential aspect of this question is the PRPP process and budgetary planning associated with the District?*

President Stover introduced the topic by reminding the body the discussion began when they considered sending three additional senators to ASCCC Spring Plenary. He reminded them the budget is small and asked how they would like to proceed with overall budgetary management.

- A senator asked if a discretionary budget from the District could be used specifically for ASCCC events, which would create a sense of camaraderie and expose Senators to statewide information on issues

- Distinction made between professional development that is discipline related and professional development for institutional well-being and support for self-governance
- Questions raised re: fundraising; the Faculty Fund Advanced Study model was referenced
- Question of bringing back Day Under the Oaks for fundraising opportunity; other ways to advertise to the campus—payroll deductions from faculty toward faculty work?
- The [form for payroll deduction](#) that goes directly to Academic Senate was referenced
- An idea of a consistent task force of the Senate for providing semiannual financial reports
- Question of faculty subsidizing the job of the District, since it's mandated in [Title 5](#) that there is an Academic Senate in college structure
- Budget is augmented for the Senate currently; encouragement to continue asking the District to increase this budget

Senator Jacobson moved to forward the *Senate Budget Overview and Management* item to next meeting's Action Agenda, seconded. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously, with 27 yes votes.

Discussion continued as senators expressed the need for a Treasurer officer position and the idea to discuss collective priorities of Senate and establish plans for funds in-depth at the Senate's Fall Retreat next semester. Time ran out on the item and the President Stover expressed appreciation for the senator's contributions.

ADJOURNMENT

President Stover adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

ALL FACULTY MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ATTEND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

This Academic Senate is created to secure the professional rights and to carry out the responsibilities of the faculty of the Sonoma County Junior College District. The faculty have the traditional right of college faculty to participate in the governance of the college. As specialists in specific disciplines and as experienced instructors, the participation of the faculty in the governance of the college is essential for the district's pursuit of its mission. As professionals, the faculty have the right and a duty to set professional and ethical standards for the conduct of their profession and to promote the excellence of their profession. In order to achieve these ends and in accordance with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53205, this Academic Senate is established.