

COLLEGE OF MARIN ACADEMIC SENATE
MEETING MINUTES
October 21, 2021
12:45 – 2:00 pm via Zoom

Senators Present: Maria Coulson, Peggy Dodge, Meg Pasquel, Kristin Perrone, Caitlin Rolston, Kyle Beattie, David King, Patricia Seery, Kevin Muller, Cara Kreit, Jessica Park, Patty France

Senators Absent: Kofi Opong-Mensah

Guests: Patrick Kelly, Jeff Cady, Nancy Willet

CALL TO ORDER: 12:45 PM – Zoom Meeting

- I. Approval and Adoption of the Agenda – **ADOPTED (Coulson/Perrone) as amended to bring Item VI: Invited Guests LRC Design Presentation to the top of the agenda by all Senators present.**
- II. Reading and Approval of the Minutes of October 14, 2021 – **APPROVED (Perrone/Park) by all Senators present**
- III. Public Requests to Address the Senate on Non-Agenda Items - **NONE**

- IV. Officers' Reports
 - a) President (Meg Pasquel) – President Pasquel reported that a question regarding hiring practices and Adverse Impact Testing (Diversity Screening Criteria) had been received from a faculty member. President Pasquel shared and briefly reviewed AP7120: Employment Recruitment and the COM Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plan. The EEO Plan includes plans to assess adverse impact in hiring practices using statistical processes. Hiring committees can interview all applicants or paper screen the applications. There is a good possibility that paper screening applications will create adverse impact on the pool of applicants. This process is why some hiring committees fail. Hiring committee members need to make the time to interview more people. President Pasquel also announced that she and VP Coulson are attending the ASCCC Plenary meeting in November and that she will distribute the packet of resolutions coming to the Plenary session to all Senators this week.
 - b) Vice President (Maria Coulson) – VP Coulson reported on an issue about asynchronous teaching and activities that make up for student contact hours required to compensate for lecture time (seat time) in classes. The Course Outline of Record would not be the right place to enumerate expectations for seat time in asynchronous classes but some official place in the process does need to enumerate those expectations. VP Coulson also announced that she will be attending the ASCCC Plenary meeting in November with President Pasquel.

- V. Committee Reports
 - a) Curriculum - **NO REPORT**
 - b) Academic Standards – **NO REPORT**
 - c) Other Senate Subcommittee and Governance Committee Reports - **NONE**

- VI. Invited Guests: Greg Nelson / David Schnee / Harding Dowell/ Beth Rhodes/Nicole Ghiselli
LRC Design Presentation – The Group 4 Architecture firm representatives presented a PowerPoint presentation (copy attached) describing where we are in the schedule for construction of the new LRC on the Kentfield Campus and the extent of engagement in the process of plan development. The architects reported that we are in the home stretch of design development, being about 60% complete. Plans then go to the Division of State Architects (DSA) which can be a 10–12-month process. Then the builder, Alten Construction, will deliver a price for the project. The LRC plan is going back before the COM Board on November 9. Fine grain decisions are being made now. The Group 4 team reported that engagement in the development of the LRC plan included meetings with the Bond working

group, I/T, M&O, future occupants of the space and public meetings (two COMMunity hour meetings and one community meeting). Additional meetings will take place as construction documents are being developed. Group 4 architects noted that the images in the PowerPoint are not actual finishes or colors. Those decisions have not yet been made. The project is on budget. Interested individuals should see the PowerPoint presentation for more details on the proposed design. The Group 4 team will return to the AS on October 18 to respond to questions from Senators after all have had adequate time to review the presentation. Clarification questions raised by Senators included:

- What is the capacity of classrooms in the plan? Group 4 response was that medium accommodates 44-48 and are being programmed for 40. The design includes 2 medium classrooms, 20 small classrooms that seat 20-28 one computer classroom that seats 36, a large classroom that seats 72, an event space that can accommodate 250 people lecture style and accommodate 80 in each section when divided.
- Is the computer classroom also the reading/writing lab? Group 4 response was no.

VII. Consent Agenda – **NO ITEMS**

VIII. Action Items

- a) AP 4023 – Course Approval – **APPROVED (Dodge/King) by all Senators present**

IX. Discussion

- a) AP 6520 – Security of District Property – UPM President Patrick Kelly updated the AS on developments and information in regard to the AS concerns expressed about the AP and the installation of surveillance cameras on campus. The installations of concern butt up against AP6520 and are not in compliance with UPM contract provisions in Article 17. There have been no changes in the situation since last week. As indicated in the letter reviewed last week from VP Greg Nelson, many surveillance cameras have been put up but the specific number is still not clear. UPM President Kelly noted that UPM sent a letter stating that the interpretation of the contract reflected in VP Nelson letter is wrong. UPM President Kelly reported that VP Jonathan Eldridge and College Council Mia Robertshaw agree. UPM President Kelly noted that AP6520 and Article 17 are not aligned but don't necessarily need to be aligned. UPM position is that what is detailed in the contract guides on issues and the AS has jurisdiction over the AP and thus regard the AP has drivers of action. UPM President Kelly advocated for a joint response from the AS and UPM in regard to the surveillance camera issue. Issues raised in the AS discussion included:

- What should be done about the cameras that were put in place without prior notice? Should those cameras be taken down, or at least disabled, until settlement of the issues surrounding their installation?
- We need to clarify whether the issue of concern is mostly about violating the notification requirements under Article 17 or about objections regarding why specific cameras were placed?
- What about administrators that are ignoring processes? Shouldn't there be some accountability for that behavior?
- AP6520 are procedures related to security of district property Do procedures regarding surveillance cameras on campus really belong in an AP that relates only to district property?
- Does video surveillance actually deter crime? What is the evidence?
- How much did all of the surveillance equipment and associated labor and maintenance agreements actually cost? Did those expenditures actually go through PRAC?
- AS President Pasquel has requested that Micol Benet look at the alignment of Article 17 and AP6520 and recommend changes for AS consideration.

X. New Business - **NONE**

XI. Adjournment: 2:08 pm