



District Participatory Governance Council Minutes
Monday, November 1, 2021, via Zoom

Members Present:

Aaron McVean (Co-Chair), Kate Browne (Co-Chair), Ron Andrade, Lindsey Ayotte, Juanita Celaya, Jesenia Diaz, David Eck, Karen Engel, Lauren Ford, Ashely Garcia, Monica Malamud, Andrea Morales, Anthony Tran, Val Tyler and Andrea Vizenor

Members Absent:

Joseph Puckett

Others Present:

Roxanne Brewer (Recorder), Jackie Escobar, Ray Hernandez, Norman Khurelchaluun, Dr. Oyame KenZoe Brian Selassie-Okpe, Manuel Alejandro Pérez, Jackie Santizo and Dr. Richard Storti

1. Call to Order/Establish Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 2:19 p.m. and quorum was met.

2. Action Item

A. Brown Act Resolution

Motion was made by Ms. Browne and seconded by Ms. Malamud to approve the Brown Act Resolution. The Council unanimously approved the resolution.

3. Statements from the Public on Non-Agenda Items

Ms. Malamud requested that meeting materials are sent prior to the Friday before the meeting. Dr. McVean said that the bandwidth at the District Office has been stretched and the new Board Clerk, Candice Bell, will be helping with the DPGC meetings. Dr. McVean said that the meeting materials would be sent at least by Thursday before the meeting.

4. Introduction of New Members

The Council welcomed new member, Yesenia Mercado.

5. Introduction of Executive Vice Chancellor Richard Storti

The Council welcomed Dr. Richard Storti as the District's new Executive Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. Dr. Storti works with the Finance Department, Human Resources, and ITS.

Dr. Storti thanked the Council and said he appreciates the hard work and passion that is put into the work that the Council is doing, especially as it relates to students. He is happy to help in furthering the District's mission and everything that we are doing.

6. Review of Board Policy Review Schedule

Dr. McVean reviewed the November 1, 2021 Memorandum to the Council regarding updating, re-numbering, and aligning District Policies and Administrative Procedures. The District will start using the Board Management Software, BoardDocs.

7. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 5, 2021 Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Vizenor and seconded by Dr. Engle to approve the April 5, 2021 meeting minutes.

The minutes for April 5, 2021 were approved by consensus.

B. Review and Approval of Minutes from the May 3, 2021 Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Malamud and seconded by Ms. Ayotte to approve the May 3, 2021 meeting minutes.

The minutes for the May 3, 2021 meeting were approved by consensus.

C. Review and Approval of Minutes from the October 4, 2021 Meeting

A motion was made by Dr. Ford and seconded by Mr. Andrade to approve the October 4, 2021 meeting minutes.

The minutes for October 4, 2021 were approved by consensus with the following amendments:

- *Move 1. Action Item A. Brown Act Resolution after #2 Call to Order/Establish Quorum.*
- *The motion for the Brown Act Resolution approval should read, 'The Council unanimously approved the resolution'.*

8. Information Items

A. Board Policies for First Review

B. Board Policies for Second Review

Draft - Preamble, Vision, Mission, Values (BP 1.01 – District Mission)

Dr. Oyame KenZoe Brian Selassie-Okpe, Dr. Manuel Alejandro Pérez and Jackie Santizo from the District Antiracism Council introduced themselves to DPGC and shared background information and their approach in working on the updated draft – Preamble, Vision, Mission, Values statements for the District. Collectively, they are the policy and procedures workgroup of the Antiracism Council. Their focus is on making sure that we generate dialog, conversations and ideas around our methods for analyzing, with an equity lens, the various policies that the Board of Trustee's approves.

District Antiracism Council's webpage can be found at: <https://smccd.edu/antiracismcouncil/>

Feedback from the Council:

- Will the District Antiracism Council Glossary Terms be updated? (Example: to include additional terms such as Anti-Asian)
- In the Preamble, it mentions hyper-marginalized students. In the glossary, hyper-marginalized and marginalized students were not listed in the glossary. There was some concern on exactly what the Preamble is trying to say; maybe it should be defined with an additional sentence or two.

- We should make sure that we are serving/representing all marginalized individuals/communities, not just the hyper-marginalized.
- Undocumented is listed in the glossary as preferred language. Will this affect campus Dream Centers?
- Skyline College Academic Senate has a Google Doc with some small language changes that will be send over to the District Antiracism Council.
- AFT is working on a Google Doc and discussing in detail and will be shared with the District Antiracism Council.
- The new mission statement is more one noted vs. the previous one that emphasized more variety and perspectives. As an example, a notation was made, 'I appreciate the focus on race and the black/white view of America they seem to present here, I am not sure it actually reflects the District's student population in the communities in which we serve'.
- It is understandable why the District's Antiracism Council choose to highlight racism and Antiblackness; however, the Preamble, Vision, Mission, Values will be posted on the District's website for current and potential students along with the community-at-large who will not have the benefit of your explanation. Some of the same things brought up by AFT could be brought up by the community-at-large. They may feel this is not capturing all of the diversity or representing our current students. Appreciation was given for all of the research that has been done and the explanations are great, most people are not going to get the benefit of those explanations. It is great to see the glossary, most people who read the District's Preamble, Vision, Mission, and Values will not be referencing a glossary. Unless the wording used is common knowledge, it is a bit dangerous to incorporate, at the present time, may still be considered jargon.
- A comment by one a constituent member asked why we are not using the most inclusive frame, 'Instead of using the word patriarchy, why not use the word, cisheteropatriarchy?'
- Can students, current, future, and past, see themselves in these statements?

Ms. Celaya said that at a Board meeting, Race, Class, and Privilege was discussed. Several years back, the parking lots at CSM were renamed after people at the top of their fields. What came out of this, all the parking lots were named after white people and it was unwelcoming it was for non-white people. We should not specify any groups and make sure we include everybody.

Ms. Browne asked if we need something in writing to take back to the constituents. Dr. Oyame KenZoe Brian Selassie-Okpe wondered if engaging directly with the various constituent groups would be productive. Dr. McVean said that ultimately, we need a document so DPGC can review and come to a consensus. He also said policies are given as much time as they need.

Ms. Malamud said we have something in writing, the Preamble, Vision, Mission, and Value statements. Language is for communication and for communication to be successful there are three elements: the source, the message, and the target. She would like to know who the target is, so we can tell if the message will reach the target. Are we developing this for ourselves, our students or the community-at-large? Who is our audience? This impacts on how we frame the message.

Dr. Pérez said he hears opportunities that they can take back which are doable. There are areas where the workgroup will have some important insight they can share along with collecting more resources. What he has heard, and is excited about, is that there is an opportunity to do a radical lift if more connection points to the resource, information, and the message.

Ms. Celaya thanked Ms. Malamud; she felt her comments were right on. She also thanked Mr. Pérez and team for coming forward and giving the Council more context on what we are trying to do. Ms. Celaya gave an example of why it is so important to be clear with our mission statements and not to write them for a specific cause but to be clear so everyone understands the meaning behind the mission statements.

Dr. McVean and Ms. Browne shared their appreciation for the work that is going into reviewing the policies.

Next steps, Dr. Oyame KenZoe Brian Selassie-Okpe, Dr. Pérez and Ms. Santizo will take this information back to the workgroup and will report to Dr. McVean and Ms. Browne with a proposed updated draft of the Preamble, Vision, Mission, Values before the Council members take the information back to their constituency groups.

Ms. Santizo will share resource materials with the Council.

BP 8.XX – Undocumented Student Fee Waiver

Dr. McVean reviewed the updates to BP 8.XX – Undocumented Student Fee Waiver. Dr. McVean said that clarity would be made regarding the title of the policy.

Dr. McVean said that the role as the Council is to recommend the policy for adoption to the Board. It is not to establish the process or procedures of the policy. The Board reviewed this policy during the first read process to make sure we were in-line with their thinking and if they would be willing to support some of the modifications. Dr. McVean said there might be some policies where it would be beneficial to get feedback from the Board.

Dr. McVean gave clarity that we have not been given any tuition waivers to any group of students prior to this policy.

Mr. Eck said he had a number of faculty noting that the policy requires undocumented students needing to be enrolled in six or fewer units at one of the more of the colleges in the District; this is tough for a student to progress.

A question was brought forth if our California Education Code was limited in any way by Federal standards in regards to the six or fewer limits requirement. Dr. McVean is not aware of any Federal standards that limit the units, it is stated in the California Education Code that we may waive tuition if the undocumented students are enrolled in six or fewer units.

Concerns were brought forth about formerly incarcerated students and their residency. Dr. McVean clarified that students must have a permanent address in the California. Whatever the student's last physical address they had is how the student would be qualified.

Language regarding subparagraph (B) will be added and Dr. McVean will send out another updated draft of BP 8.XX – Undocumented Student Fee Waiver for the Council to share with their constituents.

Dr. McVean offered to attend any constituent group meeting to help clarify this policy if necessary. This policy will be brought back to the December Council meeting as an action item if there are no significant questions or changes reported back.

9. Return –to-Campus – Spring 2022

Ray Hernandez, Covid-19 Safety Officer, updated the Council regarding Return-to-Campus in spring of 2022. Dr. McVean reviewed BP 2.90 – Covid-19 Vaccination Requirement that was adopted by the Board and will be brought back to the Board for modifications, based on legal opinion, at their next meeting. This policy is not for DPGCs action. The Board tasked the College Presidents to engage in conversations with the Associated Students on their campuses.

Feedback from the Council:

- Cal/OSHA is being dropped in the policy language so the District is not just tied to Cal/OSHA guidelines. Dr. McVean said the District’s requirements would be driven by the Covid-19 Vaccinations Requirement policy.
- What was determined at the last Board meeting regarding religious exemptions? Dr. McVean clarified that it is a legal requirement to provide religious exemptions for employees of the District. The discussion is still being held regarding the requirement for religious exemptions for students.
- How are decisions being made regarding employees who are becoming medically exempt or through a religious exemption? Mr. Hernandez said these exemptions are standard across the nation. These requests are being handled by the Human Resource Department. Mr. Hernandez reviewed the Return-to-Campus website: <https://smccd.edu/return-to-campus/>
- Students cannot take in person, face-to-face classes, if they do not have a proof of vaccination or an approved exemption. Will ITS be able to handle the volume of vaccination card submissions registration starts? Dr. McVean said that they have been working on the workload required when registration goes live. Campuses will not be locked down we will have open campuses. Mr. Hernandez explained that Program Specialist have been hired to help with the workload at each of the campuses. Currently it looks like everything should move smoothly.
- Clear messaging should be given to students that they will be dropped if they do not show proof of vaccination after they registered for classes. Dr. McVean said they would be following the same process, as a student would receive for Drop for non-Payment messaging.
- There is a concern among front line employees if students are vaccinated or not.
- If the masking requirement for employees that are vaccinated goes away, how will employees know which employees and students are required to wear a mask? How do we support a universal masking requirement? Dr. McVean suggested to bring to the November 10, 2021 Board meeting the discussion around the universal mask requirement. Dr. McVean will bring this information to those who are on the Health and Safety Committee.

10. Closing Remarks/Agenda Building

None

11. Adjournment – 4:32 p.m.

Motion was made by Ds. Ford and seconded by Mr. Eck to adjourn the meeting.