

# ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | 10/06/20 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Zoom Meeting

## Academic Senator Attendance

Jessica A. Alabi, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Lee Gordon, <i>at-Large, Vice President</i>	Present
Carol Barnes, <i>Counseling</i>	Present	Marilyn Kennedy, <i>Lit &amp; Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>	Present
Jamie Blair, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jodie Legaspi, <i>Athletics &amp; Kinesiology</i>	Present
Tyler Boogar, <i>Math &amp; Sciences</i>	Present	Doug Lloyd, <i>at-Large, Parliamentarian</i>	Present
Sean Connor, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Leland Means, <i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	Present
Eric Cuellar, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jeanne Neil, <i>Business &amp; Computing</i>	Present
Tina De Shano, <i>Consumer &amp; Health Sciences</i>	Present	Charles Otwell, <i>Curriculum</i>	Present
Jodi Della Marna, <i>Library</i>	Present	Max Pena, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Matt Denney, <i>Technology</i>	Present	Clyde Phillips, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Rendell Drew, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Loren Sachs, <i>at-Large, President</i>	Present
Cyndee Ely, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Jordan Stanton, <i>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</i>	Present
Diogba G'bye, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Stella Tsai, <i>SGOCC Representative</i>	Absent

**Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In):** Anna Hanlon, Arabian Morgan, Bob Fey, Dr. Eduardo Jesus Arismendi-Pardi, Katie McCarroll, Nathan Jensen, Pam Walker, Rebecca Morgan, Rob Schneiderman.

## 1. Preliminary Matters

- A. **Call to Order:** President Loren Sachs called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.
- B. **Approval of the Minutes – September 29, 2020:**  
**Motion 1: Senator Kennedy moved to** approve the September 29, 2020, minutes with a minor correction; motion seconded; motion approved.
- C. **Opportunity for Public Comment:** Madjid Niroumand, Eric Cuellar.
- D. **For the Good of the Order Announcements:** None.

## 2. Consent Agenda

**President Sachs** read the items on the Consent Agenda and then asked if someone would make a motion to approve.

- **Facilities Committee:** Jodi Della Marna
- **Curriculum Committee:** Leland Paxton
- **VPI Hiring Committee:** Alternate names pending EEO Certification: Thomas Mucciario, Clyde Phillips, Brent Rudmann.

A senator asked if there is a limit on how many committees an individual can be on; another senator asked if we need to do anything with the alternate names or are they for information only? **President Sachs** stated that there is no limit on how many committees one can be on and that the alternate names are there as replacements if the original members are unable to serve.

**Motion 2: Senator Means moved to** approve the consent agenda; motion seconded; motion approved, unanimously.

### 3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

- A. **Guided Pathways Reporting:** No Report
- B. **Statewide Guided Pathways Representatives:** No Report
- C. **BP/AP Committee Report – Senator Kennedy:**

Senator Kennedy submitted a written report on items A/BP 3410 Prohibition of Unlawful Discrimination, and Harassment, and Retaliation; AP/BP 3435 Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation Complaints and Investigations; and AP 5910 Sexual Misconduct; and AP 7120C Faculty Hiring. She read a few pertinent points of AP 7120C so faculty could share these items with their constituents for next week. {See appendix at the end of these meeting minutes for the report.}

### 4. Unfinished Business

- A. **IPC Membership – President Loren Sachs:**

**President Sachs** informed that after the discussion at the last Academic Senate meeting, he went back to IPC and asked that they consider adding the Online Coordinator as the third coordinator for this academic year. They agreed. The IPC Handbook states that every year the Senate is allowed to determine the three coordinators who are participating an IPC. Having the online coordinator makes a lot of sense in the current environment. As circumstances change, that can be revisited next year. In the previous version of the handbook that member was listed as the BSI coordinator; therefore, a vote is required. **Motion 3: President Sachs moved** to approve the Online Coordinator to replace the BSI Coordinator as the third coordinator on IPC for this academic year, 2020-2021.

**Senator 1:** Concurred and suggested she originally recommend the Online Coordinator because our fall and spring semesters will be done remotely. There might be technology needs and changes in faculty needs. In the future one of the coordinators of program review may need to take that position because they we will be revisiting that process. **She seconded Motion 3. Motion passed unanimously.**

- B. **Equity and Inclusion Resolution – Senator Eric Cuellar:**

**President Sachs** reintroduced the Equity and Inclusion Resolution and asked Senator Cuellar to present and update the Senate on it.

#### **Equity & Inclusion Senate Resolution**

Proposed By: Eric Cuellar; Associate Professor of Counseling & Senator at Large  
Seconded By: Dr. Rendell E. Drew, Professor/Political Science & Senator at Large  
Date: Sept. 29, 2020 (Revision)

**Whereas**, the **Coast Community College District (CCCD) Board Policy 3420** addresses Equal Opportunity by acknowledging the following: “*the District is committed to employing qualified administrators/managers, faculty, and staff members who are dedicated to student learning and success.*” It further goes on to state, that the CCCD Board is committed to the hiring and staff development process that support the goals of “*equal opportunity and diversity,*” and to those processes that provide equal consideration for all qualified candidates.

**Whereas**, as evidenced by the recent announcement on the OCC website, positions were expressed in order to address social justice and the current nationwide debates regarding “racism, social injustice and privilege” the OCC’s recent referral to the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement was well intentioned. One must objectively concede that there could be potential concern in such reference and usage.

**Whereas**, “Black Lives Matter” is the name of a movement which can be viewed as divisive by some. It is truly a reference that addresses both past, and recent incidents of nationwide social justice, by naming only one social/ethnic group (Blacks). In the view of others, this may appear to separate that group from all others by omission: Hence, it may be deemed by some to be “subjectively divisive” by the separation of one social group from others— including by many of those of the dominant culture—primarily Non-Hispanic Whites. OCC must rather take a stand of inclusiveness.

**Whereas**, OCC must continue in its commitment to the acceptance of multiculturalism, inclusion of racial, ethnic and social diversity by providing fair opportunities for all individuals to compete for hiring and promotion within the CCCD.

**Whereas**, the current and future administrative and faculty leadership of OCC will set a goal to represent the diverse demographics of the students we enroll and serve, primarily through the hiring committee processes.

**Whereas**, the best way to demonstrate OCC’s true commitment, as an inclusive institution of higher education that values social diversity and embraces the multicultural atmosphere of our campus, resides in our commitment to ensure that we create an environment which fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy, and free expression of ideas. This commitment on all search committees should apply to all individuals from all racial and ethnic, as well as other groups protected from legal discrimination.

**Be it resolved:** that all present and future administrative, and faculty search committees, shall be chaired and staffed by individuals who themselves are representative of OCC’s diverse student population, but also the “most qualified” in their respective fields and areas of knowledge. Including those who observe with integrity the OCC’s & CCCD’s policies of inclusiveness.

**Be it further resolved:** That the administrative staff, the faculty of OCC will work together and utilize the developing services of the OCC *Multicultural Center* in order to help provide educational and cultural training opportunities and experiences for our faculty, students, and staff which is unparalleled in its inclusion.

Submitted to the Academic Senate for revisions on: 9/29/20

**Senator Cuellar:** Last week they had provided the opportunity for the senators to consult their constituents in regards to input on the revised Equity and Inclusion Resolution. Senator Cuellar provided an opportunity to the Senate to see if there are any comments, additions, or amendments to be considered at this time.

**Senator 2:** Wanted to provide two questions and two comments from their division. For Whereas number 5, how will this be practically done in the hiring process? I am asking as I am receiving questions about this. In paragraph five where it states “the current and future administrative and faculty leadership of OCC will set a goal to represent the diverse demographics of the students we enroll and serve, primarily through the hiring committee processes,” there is no question about the intent but the application is the concern. On the paragraph seven which is the “Be it resolved” paragraph where it says “be chaired and staffed by individuals who themselves are representative of OCC’s diverse student population, but also the ‘most qualified,’” does that mean everybody [all committee members] or some? The language is not clear. I’d like to read from a constituent who stated that “I feel like the text of the resolution could use

a good edit. There seems to be grammatical errors, a lot of sentence fragments," and then they offered to correct a sentence for clarity where they were not sure what it meant. As the way the resolution is written now, this senator will not be able to vote on this in support [based on feedback from constituents]. The resolution's intent is not bad, so she recommends and suggests, as was stated at the last meeting by another senator, to refer this to a committee for rewriting or clarification. That would be helpful to everyone. Then we would not be going in circles, asking the same questions, and it would be easier to work on this together.

**Senator 3:** Shared her screen and presented an upcoming resolution that will be at Senate Plenary.

**\*3.02 F20 Recommendation to Update Title 5 Language for Minimum Qualifications**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted a new inclusivity statement in fall 2019—Resolution 3.03 F19, Replacing the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Inclusivity Statement—that aligns with the Board of Governor's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement;

4 Whereas, The paper Equity Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in the California Community Colleges, adopted through Resolution 3.04 F19, calls for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and local academic senates to move beyond individual actions to transformational system change addressing policies and procedures;

Whereas, Title 5, § 53024.1 acknowledges that "establishing and maintaining a richly diverse workforce is an on-going process that requires continued institutionalized effort"; and

Whereas, Title 5, § 53022 defines the minimum qualifications for all faculty positions and requires all faculty applicants to demonstrate "a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to recommend changes for consideration regarding the minimum qualifications that may include an update to the Title 5, §53022 language to exhibit and reflect the demonstration of cultural humility,<sup>5</sup> cultural responsiveness,<sup>6</sup> and equity-mindedness<sup>7</sup> that transcend "sensitivity" and further define the knowledge, skills, and behaviors in the second minimum qualification for faculty positions.

Contact: Luke Lara, Faculty Leadership Development Committee

She pointed out the language at the bottom at the resolution. The resolution is seeking to change the language in Ed Code around minimum qualifications. It is asking that the language be changed so that people will have to exhibit and reflect the demonstration of a skill set. This senator can see why people are looking to get around looking at a committee. However, she can look at a committee and tell if it is all white or not. She is not sure why senators are pretending that they can't. She recognizes that race is not the only type of diversity, but she does think that race is a type of diversity that OCC should be concerned about. She spoke about that last week. She does think that there can be a committee that is diverse in marital status, diverse in genetic makeup, diverse in disability, diverse in sex and gender and still be all white. OCC historically has a problem with whiteness. We should not pretend that we do not know that that is the problem. That we continue each week to have discussions

that the diversity issues that OCC and the District are dealing with are ones of race and ethnicity is really a problem for me. Moving beyond that, this resolution seeks to look at something much deeper and that is a value system and that is a skill set that people should be able to demonstrate if they truly embrace diversity, equity, and inclusion. She recommends looking at some of the language of the resolution presented on the screen, where it says that "they would be able to exhibit and reflect the demonstration of cultural humility, cultural responsiveness, equity mindedness that transcends sensitivity and further define knowledge, skills and behaviors." This resolution is seeking to change how we understand the second minimum qualification for faculty positions. She wanted to point this out because OCC can be left behind if it wants to. However, throughout the state, college campuses are seeking to value inclusion diversity, equity, and anti-racism. The Plenary's focus this year is anti-blackness racism, and all throughout the state people are discussing this, and passing resolutions. However, week after week, this senate tries to discuss whether we understand what diversity is and whether we can recognize it. There are people organizing and will be passing resolutions because they are not pretending that they do not understand what diversity is, like we are. This language captures quite clearly how that could be measured. If a subcommittee is being formed and the resolution is rewritten, grammatical errors should not be of importance. The subcommittee should focus on the substance of the resolved. It should talk about "can this faculty in this campus take a stand on a commitment to diverse faculty hiring?" We know that we are not in charge of hiring, right? But this faculty has for the last fifteen years I've been here has stuck its nose in everything it possibly could to try to influence it. It has tried to have consultation and influence everything it thinks is its business. Suddenly, it doesn't want to have inclusivity and diversity in faculty hiring because of grammatical errors or possibly being able to see what is going on in a committee? We know it is well known when a committee is all white and it is well known when a committee is diverse. The real issue here is that OCC has been all white for a very long time. When this senator was hired, she changed the percentage of black people. One person can change the percentage of black people at OCC. Every week I'm going to show up and talk about this, a thorn in the side. We are going to be a minority campus as the rest of the California Community Colleges move forward. We will be the one left in the dark ages.

**Senator 4:** Appreciates the input provided by Senator 2; however, the focus should be on the content of the resolution as stated by Senator 3. Everyone has different ways of saying the same thing differently. He highlighted Senator 3's courage and other colleagues of color to voice their perspectives. He has been with the District going on thirty years and he has seen some things, too. He knows what it feels like to have been part of an ethnic category where he was the whole percentage. He hopes that Senator Cuellar calls for a subcommittee. He hopes that the people that have concerns about the grammar, about the intent of the resolution, and everything else can join the subcommittee and work together to move this forward through the Senate. It is only a resolution, but it is the resolution that is making faculty look at themselves and to be honest with themselves in light of social justice. It is bothersome personally, the fact that faculty cannot seem to get to the real meat of the matter. The language has been gone from being inflammatory language to some folks saying it's been whitewashed; the reality is that this resolution is only trying to be the right fit for this institution to increase awareness and the way that it reflects the diversity and the leadership. It brings up issues of "the most qualified" but this is not new. Those

terms are heard all the time. Why is that when an issue comes to hiring diversity and the issues of intersection? These would be qualified individuals. This is very personal to some extent. The only goal is to work with right-minded/hearted people who really want to help push through this resolution through the Academic Senate. This is to be an authentic institution and support students. Demographics are changing. This is not a resolution of exclusion. This is something that Senator 3 has been hearing and that is the most preposterous thing he has heard. They are just using the language in the District's policies. The other question he heard last week was "is this a new affirmative action policy?" Has it gone through the Congress or through the various stages? He asked senators to get real and get on the same team; we are all in this thing together. He rephrased [Martin Luther King, Jr's] a quote and said, "if we don't band together as brothers, we perish together as fools." He does not want to see that happen to this institution. The changing demographics must be addressed and part of that is done by who is hired in administrative ranks, faculty ranks, and classified ranks. He encouraged all to work on the verbiage of the resolution and not to lose the main focus and the goal of the resolution.

**Senator 5:** Echoed the same sentiments as his previous colleagues, Senators 3 and 4. Last week it was talked about forming a committee to address the resolution and we were not having the meeting today to vote but to form a committee to work on the resolution. For the folks that are being critical of the resolution, he would like them to join the committee if they want to see this passed and want it to work. The remarks by Senator 3 are very important because it is something that is of an historical nature of this campus to overlook and sidestep issues with other issues that have nothing to do with the focus. The focus should be on the result of this resolution and to get this resolution moved forward. The fact that people do not feel like they can vote at this time is not even an issue because that is not what they are trying to accomplish. That is not the point of order we are at and those votes should not be registered because that is not what is being asked for. Senator 2 has data that shows demographic percentages of folks on this campus that can be used to understand where the campus is and where the campus needs to go.

**Senator 6:** Suggested to put up the demographics at the next meeting; they do answer a lot of questions. Some of the questions here are asking "how will we achieve what the board policy said by getting a diverse committee?" At some point this resolution is not saying how that is going to be done; it just says that it needs to be looked at. Part of looking at it will be looking at the current process. Like reported last week, right now there are more candidates who want to be on the hiring committee than allowed. It is done by a department popular vote. That is not helpful. I have been here forty-three years and after several years ago when they changed the board policy limiting the number of people that can be on hiring committees, we've had a problem with people being left out. Before if there were five different areas in their department that they want somebody to be teaching in, they needed five members on the committee. Usually if someone is teaching honors, they are just teaching honors; if they are teaching basic skills, they are just teaching basic skills. It is necessary to have a diverse group of people. In looking at the new hiring process we need to address a lot of things but let's not mix up the resolution and the hiring process. If we want changes from the resolution or anywhere else, those have to be put in the hiring policy and if the Senate does not do that, the administration is going to do it because it is board policy.

**Senator 7:** The revised resolution was discussed at the last division meeting. First, the division faculty believe one hundred percent in equity and inclusion. The concern is how the resolution will be used. Members of the division fear that this resolution might be used as leverage to put certain people on hiring committees that may not represent the good of the department but only their individual agendas. They are also worried about paragraph seven and do not know how to interpret that. Some of them also included different verbiage that could be included such as "this resolution is to help Orange Coast College and awareness of equity inclusion in all campus matters" that does not change the current board hiring policy. Those are some of the additions that they would like to see. They are just trying to understand paragraph seven. They fear that it excludes some groups, and they are concerned about that.

**Senator 8:** One of the overriding themes that she received was that the resolution needs to have some more discussion and some revisions. One of the comments was "it may be true that culturally diverse administrators and faculty would be much more highly to attract future administrators, faculty and students who are ethnically, culturally and socially, economically diverse but it does not necessarily mean that they will attract the most highly qualified individuals." That was one of the most common comments on the emails. This resolution has merit, but they do not want to forget the fact that they do want to hire the most highly qualified individuals.

**Senator 1:** Recommended that we see the demographics previously presented and look at them again next week, and also reiterated what her colleagues have said about the clarity. There is often a misperception of English faculty that they are focused on grammar. The actual grammar suggestion did not come from an English faculty member. It came from someone else. The issue was clarity because the lack of clarity or definitions is what we are debating right now, and it seems we all have different perceptions and interpretations; we have to work together. Volunteered to be on the committee to help with clarity so we can move beyond circular discussions and debates. When using a term, a clear definition provided [by the writer or author] prevents others from attaching their own definitions to it. The only content criticism of the resolution is the practical application but as stated before this resolution will not change the hiring policy because that has already been legally vetted. If something is passed that the hiring policy will disallow, then it makes the whole resolution moot.

**Senator Cuellar:** Stated his comment in Spanish "Sí, muchas gracias me gustaría hablar con mis colegas del Senado el punto que quiero hacer, que básicamente hay diversidad en muchas maneras distintas." In translation, "there are many ways of expressing how we feel and think." These past few weeks he has attentively been practicing active listening to all the senators' comments. He appreciates all comments. He tries to practice cultural humility and intellectual humility. He referred back that the undergirding values of this equity inclusion resolution are asking for consideration of additive empathy and for an architecture of care that we can design for the campus community to service our students.

**Motion 4: Senator Cuellar moved** that we refer this professional matter for this resolution and to make a call for willing participants from the Academic Senate to form a subcommittee to continue working on this important and timely resolution, which is the Equity and Inclusion Resolution; motion seconded;

**Senator 3:** Is glad that the Senate is finally moving this into committee and has a comment about some of the senator's constituents who has been talking about competency and qualifications of people being hired since now diversity is being talked about now and we are focusing on it. When we were hiring all white people, were we concerned about people's qualifications? Was there a concern that all the white people that were being hired would be qualified and competent? Are we only concerned about competency and qualifications now when we talk about people of color? The campus needs to be careful because this country has a history of always bringing up competencies and qualifications whenever the question of hiring people of color comes up. However, whenever the question of hiring white people comes up, there is an assumption that white people are qualified. As a sociologist, she thinks that she has presented data before that this country has a history of hiring unqualified white people. There is enough data in implicit bias research that shows that. She hopes that the senators would take that back to any of their constituents concerned that if this college has a history of hiring people who are not qualified or who are incompetent, why would they start now? Why would we start asking those questions now since we are talking about now diversity? It is inappropriate and this senator is offended.

**President Sachs:** Asked if there was any more discussion on the motion; there were no more comments. **President Sachs called for the vote on Motion 4; Motion 4 passed unanimously.** Invited Senator Cuellar if he can stay during the Executive Board meeting to work on getting the process started. The hope is to select the subcommittee that would then be able to start working on the resolution as soon as they could convene.

**C. President's Taskforce in Equity and Inclusion; Selection Criteria for Faculty Volunteers –**

**President Sachs:** Summarized where the process of the Taskforce criteria is at. Last week Beatriz Rodriguez, assistant to the Senate, sent out an interest form for senators and constituents' feedback. It was put together by Senators Alabi, Cuellar, Drew, and Gordon; HR Director Rebecca Morgan; and President Sachs. The purpose of the interest form is to work on finding the four seats as the faculty representatives for the Taskforce. President Sachs asked if anybody had any feedback. He was aware that there were some comments about making changes to the last question to include examples or framing the question differently.

**Senator 2:** Normally there is a [Senate] protocol and a resolution for a call out for a committee and how it is to be done. The committee would have some parameters. The requirement is that faculty members have to say yes, they met those; they are the ones who acknowledge that they have met them, and their names are put in a pool and names are drawn. There are some concerns because the Taskforce is actually the President's and senators have moved away from the Taskforce force mission statement, which should be sent out to the people who want to be in the committee and ask if they are on board. The interest form looks like an application for a job and it was decided earlier that they do not want faculty to be pushed away if they want to join a committee with good intent. They can have candidates agree to go through training. Last week, one of the senators said something about not excluding people and keeping them away. During this time of the semester, if somebody is given a long script like this, they are liable to put it off and not do it. Senators needs to be careful as they do not want to write something that looks narrow to a particular group of people, in particular if anybody who is writing this is applying for this

position. There has to be caution on that. Normally with call outs, they have a little bit of an overflow, but not a lot.

**Senator 5:** Stated that they are at a point where they are ready to choose folks who want to be on the resolution committee to develop the resolution since it was requested last week by Senator Cuellar [referring to the prior resolution on the agenda.] If we don't have an established committee, we have several volunteers. We are at the point where we can work on the resolution. We cannot postpone that until next week.

**Senator 4:** Mentioned that was going to be done on the E-board and asked for clarification on the process.

**President Sachs** stated that if it is the will of the Senate to spend the rest of the meeting to get committee members someone needs to make a motion.

***Motion 5: Senator Cuellar moved to put a call out on the floor during the current meeting to find individuals to form a subcommittee for the Equity and Inclusion Resolution; motion seconded; motion approved, unanimously.***

**The volunteers were the following senators:** Boogar, Cuellar, Drew, Kennedy, Phillips, and President Sachs

**Senator 3:** Returned to the discussion of the Task Force committee selection criteria, agreeing that the application is long as she participated in reviewing it. It both supports someone who is serious about being on the committee and it does discourage someone who is not serious, which is important. This is a different stage and time. What the President is trying to do is something new at OCC. This is not business as usual. This should not be approached like a usual committee. This should be special. If people are discouraged because it is too long and it asks questions that are too contemplative, then they should not get on the committee. People who take the time to fill out the questions and they feel like it is a job application, but they want to do it, they should do it. The people who took the time to be on the subcommittee to look at this and put it together felt that it should be like this and people who fill it out are people who are serious. The application is long, but it would affirm the seriousness of people who are interested.

**Senator 4:** Asked if anything was done regarding the previous question about legal issues. He said the Senate needs to be careful about the information requested. Is it okay with the way it is written? Ensure privacy and legality in terms of pending issues.

**Senator 3:** I think it is fine the way it is written. I have seen other ones and people have not put any personal information that is not being requested. Are we waiting to call the question on this?

**President Sachs:** Yes, because there are still some hands up who want to speak.

**President Suarez:** Acknowledged the fact that the Senate is having these conversations that she knows are difficult. She knows that they are uncomfortable, and she knows that they are necessary. She thanked the Senate because it is not easy. President Suarez appreciates the thoughtfulness that went into creating the Interest Form. She is excited for the Senate to look at individuals who apply, who volunteer to serve on the Taskforce. They have been very thoughtful about making sure that people understand the importance of the work that they want to do at OCC. She thanked the Senate for that. To address

Senator 4's point, HR Director Rebecca Morgan was also part of this committee so there are no legal issues with the form.

**Senator 2:** Stated a point of order, as there is a resolution that was passed in 2018 [Senate Resolution #S-2018-1] that this violates; if it passes it will be moot. The resolution from 2018 requires that if people want to be appointed on a committee, they have to meet the standards desired and tell the Senate affirmatively and briefly that they met them and then their names go in the pool. That is what we have as policy right now. If people vote in something that is against what is already previously approved, it won't work that way. In responses to questions directed to her from Senator 3 about clarification, she noted that this is also for appointments to task forces. It was written because the Senate did not want to exclude people who wanted to participate on committees or task forces. The resolution that passed on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018, says "all volunteers who have acknowledged that they have met preferences or requirements will be placed in the drawing lot. During the fall and winter semesters, the names will be drawn at an E-board meeting." The requirements and preferences are listed, but those volunteers who respond just state that they met them, but not provide long responses or answers as this form seems to require [that must be vetted by others].

**President Sachs:** There needs to be some discussion on this because there are some different interpretations. This will be the first order of business next Tuesday.

## 5. Adjournment of the Regular Meeting

President Sachs adjourned the meeting at 12:32 P.M.

## Approval of the Minutes: October 6, 2020

**MINUTES:** First draft written by Beatriz Rodriguez, Administrative Assistant to the Senates. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

# Voting Tallies Chart

Motion 1 Minutes 09/29/20	Motion 2 Consent Agenda	Motion 3 Online Coordinator on IPC	Motion 4 Equity & Inclusion Resolution to Committee	Motion 5 Equity & Inclusion Resolution Committee Selection of Members	Senate Membership
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Alabi, Jessica A.: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2018-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Blair, Jamie: Senator-at-Large (2018-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Boogar, Tyler: Math and Sciences Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Connor, Sean: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Cuellar, Eric: Senator-at-Large (2018-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Denney, Matt: Technology Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	De Shano, Tina: Consumer Health Sciences Senator 2020-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2020-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	G'bye, Diogba: Part-Time Senator (2020-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Gordon, Lee: Vice President, Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Kennedy, Marilyn: Secretary, Lit and Lang Senator (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Legaspi, Jodie: Athletics and Kinesiology Senator (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Lloyd, Doug: Parliamentarian, Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Means, Leland: Visual and Performing Arts Senator (2018-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Neil, Jeanne: Business and Computing Senator (2019-2022)
--	--	--	--	--	Otwell, Charles: Curriculum Chair (Non-Voting) (Open)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Pena, Max: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Phillips, Clyde: Senator-at-Large (2020-2021)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Sachs, Loren: President, Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Stanton, Jordan: Soc and Beh Sciences Senator (2019-2022)

## Appendix

### District Consultation Council Board Policy and Administrative Procedure (BPAP) Subcommittee Report

Submitted by Marilyn Kennedy to OCC Academic Senate on October 6, 2020

**AP/BP 3410 Prohibition of Unlawful Discrimination, and Harassment, and Retaliation—revision:** Revisions are due to changes in Title V [state] and Title IX [federal].

**AP/BP 3435 Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation Complaints and Investigations:** Updated to be consistent with changes due to Title IX, and already implemented in the AP 5910 Sexual Misconduct policy.

**AP 5910 Sexual Misconduct—Revision, Update:** Moved forward to the Board of Trustees after our reviews.

#### **AP 7120C Faculty Hiring—Revision, Update:**

**First, a response in regards to hiring and the hiring policy:** Asked if it was legal to exclude someone from a hiring committee based on race, ethnicity, national origin, marital status, gender, sexual orientation, age, political beliefs, veteran status, socioeconomic status, disability, religion, etc. **Response:** no

Asked how the diversity make-up of a hiring committee will be ascertained if it is not well known or apparent as to one of the above characteristics. Can faculty be asked or required to disclose or reveal private information? **Response:** Faculty cannot be required to reveal any information, but the idea is to have a variety of ages, genders, races, etc. on a committee.

#### **This is coming back for review for two reasons:**

**(1)** The CFE representative argued (she said per the request of the CFE President) that tenured faculty should have preference over tenure-track faculty on faculty hiring committees, but no other constituency (including both other Senates) supported this. The CFE rep requested this should be revisited (she seemed to be citing our resolution on the agenda as supportive of this).

**(2)** The District is pushing for the College President to be able to add more than one VP (one VP has always been allowed) and any other faculty or administrators to the selection committee without providing any reason. Right now, the selection committee is made up of the College President; a college VP, if they desire; the search committee chair if a discipline faculty, if not, a discipline faculty member designee from the hiring committee. Coastline's Senate rep argued that more faculty should be on this committee, not less, and certainly not more administrators, but the administration is pushing to get on more VPs and other faculty or administrators at the College President's discretion.

#### **This are the approved changes:**

**(1) The College President Can Disapprove of a Search Committee and Adjust It with the Academic Senate:** The College President or designee will be allowed to review hiring committees for diversity but any attempt to readjust must be done in collaboration with the Academic Senate. Ideally, that would require information as to why and the department or its hiring committee could provide input to the Senate on if the changes should be accepted or not.

**(2) HR/EEO Diversity Checks at Each Step:** Stayed as before.

**(3) Part-Time Hiring:** The Part-Time search and selection committee composition is at minimum, to include the Division Dean or designee and the faculty department chair or designee. This is to accommodate the three colleges' slightly divergent methods of having one or two faculty members on the team.