ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | May 3, 2022 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Zoom

Academic Senator Attendance	
Absent	Present
Present	Present
Present	Present
Present	Absent
Present	

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Renee De-

<u>Approval of the Minutes:</u> *Motion 1:* Senator Kennedy moved to approve the April 26, 2022, meeting minutes with a minor change; motion seconded; motion approved. {See voting tallies at the end of these minutes.]

D. For the Good of the Order:

Senator By: Announced that the Communities of Practice for Part-Time Faculty is going to have a meet and greet out in front of MBCC on Monday, May 16. She extended the invitation to meet the part-time faculty and the committee members; they will also be planning topics for next year.

Senator Kennedy: Stated she had a comment to make to the Senate. She has received complaints from her division regarding the draw for the tenure-track evaluation committee appointees and not following transparency or the Brown Act. After repeated emails in the last two weeks, the E-board finally amended that issue last week, so everything on the consent agenda today was done through the correct process. However, at that E-Board meeting, there was a motion made and then a two-to-one vote to separate out one appointee position and exclude all faculty volunteers and leave a single faculty member/volunteer in that pool; the secretary objected, and other E-Board meeting]. Therefore, my division has a consistent continuing complaint of a member being excluded and that person also has concerns that there are other faculty who have been left out. The E-Board is aware of the continuing concerns because of

4. New Business

A. <u>Part-Time Senator Elections</u>: Professors Jason Ball, Nina Calabretta and Steven Chang previously submitted nominations for the Part-Time Senator positions. Senator Kennedy nominated Professor Cyndee Eley from the floor; she accepted the nomination. The nominees were given the chance to make statements from the floor:

> Steven Chang: In the absence of Steven Chang, Administrative Assistant to the Senate, Beatriz Rodriguez Vaca, read his previously submitted statement aloud: I have always been interested in serving on the Academic Senate but had issues with my schedule. I have previously served on Academic Senate and have served on various committees at several campuses. I have been part-time at OCC for four years.

Senator Ball: 1 am really excited about the prospect of continuing to work with you all here in the Senate. I have myself a lot of experience working in 10+1 or

The first item that he wanted the Senate to discuss was Goal 5, Objective 5.1. which states the following:

μ

President Gordon: Asked if there was a motion with respect to Goal 5, Objective 5.1 of the DEIA draft report, in favor of or opposition to.

Senator Kennedy: Stated she had read the comments the previous night and was stunned by them, but one of the overwhelming statements was the not have this in the DEIA plan. She originally thought it was more of an Academic Freedom Committee concern, but it was very clear from the faculty that they strongly objected to this item. More surprising was the amount of negative, strong complaints about the entire document; however, this item was the number one concern, the second one being mandatory training.

President Gordon: Stated he wanted the items dealt with one at a time, and asked Senator Kennedy if she wished to introduce a motion at this time, expressing the sense of the Senate that syllabus screening should be withdrawn from the DEIA report.

Senator Kennedy: Motion 4: Yes.

President Gordon: It's been moved by Senator Kennedy; is there a second to the motion? Motion seconded. He asked for discussion.

CFE President Schneiderman: He raised his concern that this could potentially be a violation of Section 12.14.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement which does outline what needs to be in the syllabus.

Senator Calabretta: Asked if student were included in the review process in the document.

DEIA Task Force Member Anna Stiles Hanlon: Shared are that the intent was never to have students involved and the details have not been defined in the document. It is just an overarching goal with some objectives and the details would be left to the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee. To answer Senator guestion, nowhere in the plan does it indicate students would be reviewing syllabi.

Senator DeShano: Noted that in the actual plan in 5.1, it does specifically state involving students in the process of review.

Vice-President Drew: He is in agreement with much of the concerns about the syllabi. What qualifications and standards do students have to do so? He is vehemently opposed to the student review process of the course syllabus as faculty have evaluations and other processes; we have peer review and all that, so he does not think students should be directing our syllabi, but that we should be sensitive to the changing DEIA efforts and strategies that they are attempting to implement because that keeps coming up. We don't want to water down our syllabi to fit one particular thing, but we want to make sure that we're inclusive but not give up our academic freedom; we don't want to give up the fact that we are already evaluated in a peer process situation.

Senator Ely: Stated she appreciated the desire and spirit to include appropriate language and for us to individually review our syllabibut does not like the peer review part or think it needs to be required. She would encourage the Task Force to develop a rubric or language that would be provided to faculty and encourage usjust like we have received before regarding video recording when we have our remote learning. That language should be standard and provided to us after it is fully vetted by union,

There have been many compliments about the plan, but there have also been some negative comments; his first review of the comments is positive Motion 7: Moved for a sense of the Senate and a vote of the Senate to approve the overall DEIA plan with the changes from today.

Motion 7A, to amend: Senator Sachs moved to amend Vicethat the reassurances that have been given today that there will be a full vetting of dialogue and procedures and methodologies be included in the approval that they give. He stated that sometimes the input gets devalued. There are currently a lot of questions, and it is obvious from the comments that have been made. It has to be very clear that this approval is in effect understanding that there are going to be things that are going to have to be fixed at the back end; motion to amend seconded; motion to amend approved. [S