

**SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211**

Senators Present

Emma Breeden
Cale Crammer
Shawn Cummins
Steven Deeley
Lisa Dela Cusack
Alicia Frost
Alana Gates
Melissa Govea
Song Graham
Scott Howell
Kim Johnson
Vanessa Jones
Daniel Oase
Eden Quimzon
Andy Salcido
Shereen Siddiqui
Barbara Sproat
Yanina Valdos

Senate Executive Board Present

President Michael DeCarbo
Vice President Mike Taylor
Secretary/Treasurer Mary Mettler
CIC Chair Darlene Diaz

Senators Absent

Maria Chaidez
Ricardo Chavez
Phillip Crabill
Randy Scott

ASG Representative

Vincent Vargas

Guests

Doug Deaver
Tiffany Gause
Kendrick Kim
Narges Rabii

I. Welcome

II. Approval of the Minutes

- A. Approval of the minutes from the November 6, 2018 senate meeting (Deeley/Crammar). Passed, no dissent.

III. Public Comments

- A. Professor Kendrick Kim - The National Technical Honors and Phi Beta Lambda have three upcoming events:
1. Toy Drive for Foster Youth – December 3rd – 17th. They will be collecting unwrapped toys and supplies for foster youth from infancy to teens.
 2. Wise Guys Pizza Fundraiser - Dec 6th. The first 100 guests receive a free piece of pizza and funds will be raised from 11 a.m. until closing.
 3. Financial Literacy for Home Buying Seminar - April 27 and 28, 2019. There will be free tacos for first 100 participants 9 a. m. to 5 p.m.
- B. Professor Jones – The Math and Science Chairs met and discussed the SCC Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) process. The Chairs would like to see a more formal process for allocating funds for resources when new funds become available after the initial distribution and ranking. They also wanted to know the reason for Chairs continuing to rank personnel, since no monies are earmarked for staff.
- C. Professor Siddiqui – The students of GSWS 101 invite everyone to participate in the 3rd Annual “That Takes Ovaries” Open Mic event on Wednesday, November 28th from 11:50-1:15 in the grassy area beside the library. The students will also have a clothing drive to support Laura’s House.

IV. AS Executive Board Reports

President

- A. A new Administrative Regulation (AR) 2431 [Chancellor Selection] passed at yesterday's District Council meeting. The proposed Screening Committee has a significant imbalance of administrators and District Office staff in comparison to faculty and students. Since this is not in compliance with the RSCCD participatory governance structure, President DeCarbo plans on recommending that the Board of Trustees not accept this AR as written.
- B. Concerns about how new funds are spent discussed at the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee. The Budget Committee will strive to maintain an updated list of funded items. It is important to note that when new funds become available during the academic year, SCC President Hernandez has discretion to distribute those funds. He typically uses the prior year's PIE rankings as a guide for his decision-making. PIE will continue to examine how to make the process more transparent.
- C. As President DeCarbo received no additional comments to the Sabbatical Committee's updated structure, it shall exist as presented. He also noted that there are eight sabbatical reports available to view in the Senate classroom on the bookshelf.
- D. There is a hiring committee for the district for the Strong Workforce that needs an SCC faculty participant. If anyone wants to serve on this or any other district hiring committee, please contact President DeCarbo.
- E. March 22nd is Community Science Night! Faculty can create their own demonstrations or assist with other parts of this event.
- F. The fall SCC Art Sale is November 28 and 29.
- G. As President DeCarbo received no comments regarding the new Distance Education (DE) Committee revising the DE Certification program as part of the committee's operational duties, the committee should continue to make the revisions,
- H. RSCCD Chief Toni Bland is resigning and will be replaced by Mike Toledo in the interim.

Vice President

- A. The October 2018 Academic Senate Rostrum is available and should be distributed to faculty.

Secretary/Treasurer

- A. No report

CIC

- A. eLumen trainings continue next week.
- B. Two work experience courses are coming through CIC, one from Child Development and one from Biology for their Biotech program. TV/Film is now CINE with a few new courses and Certificate of Achievement. The Reading had their first reading for the Reading Proficiency for Plan A, Area G.

V. ASG Report

- A. The ASG Town Hall was last week and students completed a survey. There were questions regarding library hours.
- B. Last week was the Great Smoke Out where students were offered a turkey sandwich if they chose to quit smoking cold-turkey. There will be a stop smoking campaign for both smoking and vaping.

VI. Summary Reports

- A. The Professional Development Week calendar is on today's senate agenda.

VII. Action Items

Second Reading

- A. **Resolution F2018.05 – Recommendation for Suspension of Drop for Non-Payment Policy (Diaz/Salcido)**
Passed, no dissent.

B. Resolution F2018.06 – Recommendation to Create the Student Conduct Committee (Crammer/Howell)

Discussion: Motion to adopt the revised description as presented (Crammer/Howell). Passed, no dissent. Should SCC's College Council approve this resolution, the Student Conduct Task Force (SCTF) will assist in the development of the Student Conduct Committee (and will review the student discipline process as its first task).

It was recommended that SCC create a values statement and post expectations of conduct in each classroom. The signage would be similar to the "No Recording" Signs. President DeCarbo asked if the SCTF would be willing to begin this process; they agreed.

Perfected resolution: Passed, no dissent.

First Reading

A. Spring 2019 Professional Development Calendar (Dela Cusacks/Cummins)

Comments:

- Faculty Forum – The contact is Mike Taylor.
- The Faculty Fiesta sponsored by the Academic Senate will be the Thursday evening February 7th. A question was raised about moving the Math and Sciences division meeting to an earlier time so those faculty can attend the fiesta on time. This will be brought back to the Professional Development committee for consideration.

Passed, no dissent.

B. Resolution F2018.07 – Adoption of the Revised Plan A Associates Degree General Education "Mathematics Proficiency" (graduation petition code G:G1) Policy (Diaz/Graham)

Discussion: This update to Plan A is to be in compliance with AB705.

* Motion to waive 2nd read of Resolution F2018.07 (Diaz/Graham). Passed, no dissent.

Resolution F2018.07 - Passed, no dissent.

C. Resolution F2018.08 – Adoption Affirmation of Revisions to the Student Success and Equity Committee Collegial Governance Handbook Description (Diaz/Siddiqui)

Discussion:

- ASG representative Vincent Vargas requested that all the students be recommended by the ASG.
 - The Student Success and Equity (SS&E) Committee wanted to expand the opportunity to additional students to serve. These students may come from a disproportionately impacted group, but may not be involved with ASG.
 - ASG representative Vincent Vargas presented California Code, which states that consultation must be made the ASG.
 - A senator suggested that ASG participates in the process by evaluating potential representatives to the SS&E Committee, but might not make the final selection.
- A senator recommended that one of the students comes from the Continuing Education program.
- A senator noted that the SS&E Committee's responsibilities appear to be expanding, and may conflict with other SCC constituent groups charges (i.e., RSCCD union workplace issues, PIE funding, and SCC Academic Senate purview).
 - The SS&E Committee is moving to recommend the inclusion of an equity lens throughout our campus.
- A senator requested that the Continuing Education program be included in the responsibilities, as well as receive an equitable distribution of funds.
- A senator noted that the SS&E Committee's Mission is to reflect the committee's vision. However, the SS&E Committee has yet to develop a new vision, so doing so might be a good starting point for the development of the mission.

D. Resolution F2018.09 – Declaration of “No Confidence in Associate Dean of Student Development Loretta Jordan (Frost/Sproat)

Discussion:

- Liz Thomas, a Financial Aid Analyst, provided the comments in support of Associate Dean Jordan and requested that the resolution be voted down for insufficient evidence; she spoke of having all student issues resolved to her complete satisfaction and questioned the legitimacy of the Student Discipline Task Force report. Liz believes that the problem is institutional.
- Professor Gause provided handouts of faculty testimonials that were distributed during the Senate meeting. See Appendix A.
- Professor Dela Cusack read a statement from a faculty member who had concerns regarding the administration of a student club. See Appendix B.
- The position should be an advocate; however, the resolution appears to be written in a manner that looks as if the request is made to have the position eliminated.
- Associate Dean Jordan has been inconsistent with her responsiveness to faculty. The senator has been stalked by a student and received no response when she approached Associate Dean Jordan. However, upon discussion with a security officer the faculty member discovered that there was an arrest warrant for the student in question.
- A senator questioned whether a formal recommendation by administration had been addressed with Associate Dean Jordan in the past, possibly through the yearly review process.
 - President DeCarbo noted that administrators have a two-year contract and that yearly reviews are typically conducted by SCC administration, faculty and staff who are chosen by the administrator who is being reviewed.
- If the Student Conduct Committee is formed, it aims to involve greater communication, and checks and balances, as currently, only one person is making decisions and errors can be made. If this resolution is premature, should not the Student Conduct committee be formed first?
- The track record of Associate Dean Jordan has been problematic for faculty and students, and many feel vulnerable in the process.
- A senator was a victim of a student’s physical abuse, stalking and false imprisonment. Associate Dean Jordan followed district policy. We need to address student discipline issues from the top down starting with the district, rather than the bottom up.
- This resolution is not requesting to terminate Associate Dean Jordan, rather the resolution is requesting than she not have a role with students.
- A senator was recently formally disciplined without due process. Shouldn’t the senate provide the opportunity to model due process by allowing Associate Dean Jordan the opportunity to respond prior to this resolution?
- A statement was read from Nena Baldizon-Rios who said that she was not in support of this resolution as her personal experiences with Associate Dean Jordan have been positive. She requested that the senate table this resolution prior to voting. See Appendix D.
- A senator’s experience with Associate Dean Jordan has been positive. He views this as a systemic issue that should be addressed through conflict resolution since both sides are unhappy. He requested that the resolution be tabled.
- We have had a lack transparency, communication, and consistency and there is an abuse of power.
- A letter was read regarding a student who participated in the UMOJA program. Associate Dean Jordan spent a great deal of time with the student and attempted to manipulate her. The student eventually went to President Hernandez to complain about Associate Dean Jordan’s manipulation.

- There are concerns about the student discipline process, as well as the amount of power and control the position carries. A solution may be that Associate Dean Jordan not meet with students on her own.
- Since this resolution is emotional and senators represent our divisions, and constituents, could we vote on this a closed session?
 - President DeCarbo said that due to the Brown Act, all of our votes must be public.
 - Narges Rabii spoke as our faculty union representative.
 - She recommended that non-tenured senators not be covered into voting for or against this resolution.
 - She said that our union will not tolerate any retribution/retaliation related to this or any senate vote.
 - Many of the issues raised in the resolution are related to working conditions. There is a process that needs to be followed.

*** Motion to extend this meeting 15 minutes (Cummins/Gates), passed no dissent.

- This resolution is similar to the resolution presented at the State Academic Senate meeting for a vote of no confidence for the CCCO Chancellor. There was discussion that should the resolution be voted down, it could be interpreted as a vote of support for the Associate Dean Jordan.

*** Motion to postpone this resolution until the Student Conduct Committee can meet and begin their process. (Salcido/Breeden)

President DeCarbo pointed out that if the Student Conduct Committee does not pass in the College Council, that the motion will be moot.

Discussion

- Many constituents are ready for a vote today.
- No action plan has been developed for the Student Conduct Committee.
- Motion to postpone this resolution passes.
 - Favor: Breeden, Crammer, Cummins, Deeley, Gates, Graham, Howell, Johnson, Jones, Oase, Quimzon, Salcido, Valdos
 - Against: Dela Cusack, Diaz, Frost, Govea, Siddiqui, Sproat
 - Abstain: Mettler, Taylor

VIII. Discussion Items

A. Signature Programs – Model United Nations

Discussion was postponed until next meeting.

B. Educational Master Plan Goals mapping to the CCCCO Vision for Success

Discussion was postponed until next meeting.

C. Spring Plenary

Discussion was postponed until next meeting.

IX. Moved to adjourn (Deeley/Breeden). Passed, no dissent.

Appendix A

A1

Problem: Two days after I submitted several incident reports, which involved threat to hurt self and others, they had not been reviewed.

Possible Solution: Prioritizing incident reports that involve threats/violent behavior. Reports which include threat to “kill” self and hurt others should raise a red flag and follow a different path in the process.

Problem: Inter-department communication of clearances. Security Officers did not come to my class to remove student, instead they waited for Associate Dean of Student Development to end her meeting to confirm the status of student. Their exact words, “Don’t want a lawsuit in our hands”.

Solution: A system for notifying officers and instructors of clearances in a timely manner. If there is no notification, there is no clearance and student should not be allowed on campus.

This incident had several elements that parallel tragedies our nation has become far too familiar with. The current bureaucratic protocols have become a hindrance that put the safety of our students and staff in jeopardy. My sincerest hope is that we do not ignore this incident because its conclusion was not a tragic one and we take this as an opportunity to discuss, examine and evaluate our current policies.

10/3/2017

Approximately 5:40pm

Visibly distraught student S. M. (female) came to my office during office hours and showed me a thread of text messages from classmate A.A. (male), in which he was distraught over rejection from a third classmate A.D., the texts included threats to kill himself and hurt others in the class. Additionally, student S.M expressed concerns for two additional classmates (K.I., M.J.) that student A. A was also texting.

5:48pm

Called Safety and Security. Safety and Security Officer Ken Gouldsmith and another officer arrived and collected information from student S.M. Safety and Security called Admissions Office for student A. A’s schedule, they learned that he was in class and they left to talk to him.

Safety and Security reassured us they would follow up depending on their findings.

Approximately 8pm

Safety and Security returned to my office to inform me that after a brief discussion with student A. A, they deemed it appropriate to call the City of Orange Police department to transport him to receive medical evaluation.

Safety & Security stated they had explained to student A. A that he was not to return to campus until he was cleared by the hospital and additionally, he needed to be cleared by the Associate Dean of Student Development.

I was instructed to call Safety & Security if he showed up prior to being cleared. They said, I would receive an email to notify me of the outcome and clearance. I was also told student would NOT return before 72 hours.

I submitted an incident report before I left for the day.

10/5/2017

Approximately 1:10pm

I saw student A. A in the Humanities building. I remembered I had been told he would not be able to return until he was cleared, so I hurried to my classroom to check my emails, I thought I had missed the email from the Associate Dean of Student Development. I looked at all my emails from the day before and that morning, but there was no email.

As I was searching, student K. I. (female) walked in visibly distraught, she showed me text messages she

received from student A. A.

Texts she shared with me were from the evening when student A. A had been taken by the City of Orange Police department, he wanted K.I to go pick him up from the hospital. He threatened to kill himself and was blaming students in class, in particular student S. M. For what had happened to him.

1:20pm

I immediately called Safety & Security to confirm clearance of student A. A. (Since I had not received the written notice) The officer I spoke with had no knowledge of the situation. I briefly explained the situation and asked for officers to come to my classroom as I had not received a clearance from the Associate Dean. The officer said it would be best to talk to Ms. Jordan!!! I insisted I needed our Security Officers to come to my class. The officer then transferred me to Ms. Jordan.

As I was explaining the situation to Ms. Jordan, she interrupted and wanted to know who had given me that number and asked if she could call me back as she was in the middle of a meeting.

I explained that the matter was urgent as the student had threatened to kill himself and harm others and the class he is in was about to start. She then explained that she had not yet read the report and would have to call me back.

1:25pm

Student S. M. arrived and I asked her to join me outside and explained to her that I had seen student A. A earlier, but I was unsure if he would actually show up to our class. Knowing now that he blamed her for his grievances and not wanting to further escalate the situation, I excused her from class and asked her to go home.

1:30pm

I began teaching. At this time, student A. A was not in class and Safety & Security had not arrived.

Approximately 2pm

Student A. A walked into class. Safety and Security had not arrived!!!. Not knowing, student A. A's mental state and not wanting to provoke him, I continued to with the lesson.

Approximately 2:15pm

Safety and Security FINALLY arrived (almost an hour after I had made the request) and signaled me to come outside. (This was exactly what I had wanted to avoid) They explained that they would be removing student A. A. I returned to the classroom and asked student A. A to go outside. He collected his belongings and left.

Approximately 3:15pm

Dismissed class early

Students M. J, A. D and K. I returned to class. They stated they had additional text message threads they would like to share with Safety and Security. Furthermore, student A. A was continuing to text them after his removal from the class. He was actually texting while he was in the office.

3:18pm

I called Safety and Security and requested Officer Gouldsmith (he started his shift at 3:00 pm) to come to my classroom.

Approximately 3:25pm

Officer Gouldsmith arrived and I explained that the young ladies had additional information to share with him that pertained to the case. I also explained what had happened prior and during my class that day and expressed my concerns for students and my own safety.

Officer Gouldsmith reassured us that we were right to be concerned and advised that we download the livesafe app.

At this time, one of the officers who removed student A. A from the classroom returned to my class. I asked why they took nearly an hour to arrive. He stated he was seeking confirmation from Ms. Jordan and had to wait until her meeting concluded to speak to her. He also stated student A. A had been suspended and he would not be allowed to return until he was cleared.

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

With the safety of my students and my own safety in mind, we discussed the need for a security officer by the door during class. We were relocated to different classrooms for our safety because student A.A was still allowed to be on campus. I advised the students to park in different lots as not to follow a routine.

B1

This is my story. It is not my only story, but it is my worst.

I will do my best to touch upon the main parts, as there are too many instances and details to cover.

This began in Spring 2017

Initially, this student was disruptive in class asking questions that were off topic and making inappropriate comments. He became progressively more confrontational and aggressive both verbally and nonverbally.

He called my office several times a week and came to every one of my office hours asking more inappropriate questions and often not willing to leave.

I learned that this student had previous interactions with other professors on campus and he himself told me he had an unspecified psychosis with anger issues. That was confirmed by the dean.

The boundaries that I set with him did not work so I invoked the two-day suspension from my class. It was during this time that I started to hear information from the other students in my class.

Several told me that if he were to return to our class they would drop the course because they were frightened for their safety.

Two other students, who were military veterans, told me they had spoken with each other and had been strategically sitting in certain places in the classroom so that if he became violent they could intervene. Another student told me that he would purposefully sit behind the harassing student so that he could pat down the harassing student's backpack with his barefoot to feel for any firearms. It was my understanding at that point that the student would no longer be allowed to attend my class. However, he did return to my class and 6 students immediately fled the classroom and called security. Security removed him from my classroom and I learned that he was yelling, causing a scene and being very confrontational with officers.

We moved classrooms at that point as students and myself were no longer comfortable being in the same classroom.

I was told he would no longer be allowed to return to class but I was asked to allow him to submit the rest of his assignments so he could finish the class.

Once the semester was over, I thought he was expelled and hoped that would be the end of it, but neither was the case.

Over the summer I received messages from him through social media stating that he missed me and why am I messing with him.

He then messaged my husband with lies that I was cheating on him. When I reported this, I was told that "according to the student this is accurate."

I then learned he was still an SCC student enrolled in a summer course. He was suspended for ten days but not expelled. A hold was placed on his record so he would have to be vetted before returning.

I emailed him a cease and desist letter upon which he sent me several emails telling me just how he felt about that.

I filed a restraining order and it was immediately approved by a judge until a hearing could take place. I had to cancel classes in the Fall semester of 2017 to attend that hearing where I was also forced to face him. Through a mediator he signed the paperwork to never contact or come anywhere near me, my husband, or my three children.

A few weeks later I discovered messages he had sent me after he was served with the restraining

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

order. He sent me a picture of his penis and called me a racist.

A few months later I received a phone call from Alistar Winter who informed me that this student and his father had been to the district to file a variety of complaints against me and had now taken his complaints to the state level.

At which time I became under formal investigation and was interviewed by an independent investigator. I was accused of harassment and discrimination. I was asked questions about whether or not I was in love with him, about whether or not I orchestrated a robbery of his mother's home and something about the Mexican mafia.

This past August I received a summary of the investigative report, which concluded there was no evidence to support any of his accusations but that he has the right to appeal.

C1

At the beginning of the spring 2018 semester, a student in my Human Sexuality class made a comment about homosexuality that offended many students in the class, including several LGBTQ students. After processing the incident as a group and revisiting our class expectations for discussion, I hoped that the situation would be resolved. Unfortunately, the student who made the initial comment became increasingly hostile and antagonistic. He would mutter under his breath, disparage me to other students before I entered the classroom, and behave erratically during lectures and discussions. I was concerned about the noticeable change in behavior. The initial incident occurred only a week or so after the Parkland, Florida school shooting. As the parent of a former Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School student and someone who has spent my adult life either actively working in the community as a violence educator and crisis intervention specialist OR researching and teaching about violence, I am particularly attuned to the warning signs of violence. It crossed my mind that this student's behavior could escalate. After one particular incident when he stormed out of class while we were viewing a documentary, two students in the class approached me to share that they were scared of him. When he left the class abruptly, they thought he might go to his car and come back with a weapon. When I realized that students in the class were feeling threatened, I decided to file an incident report.

The report, unfortunately, worsened the situation. I didn't realize that the student would be confronted about the behavior. Had I known, I probably would have taken a different approach. As someone who researches and teaches about violence, I know that shame and the feeling of being disrespected are often motivating forces for men who commit violence. After the student became aware of my report, the classroom environment and his behavior toward me became even more hostile.

I felt that my class was hijacked by the student, and no one was doing anything to stop it, despite my repeated pleas for help. The classroom environment was toxic for me and the rest of the students. One of the students who had been targeted stopped coming to class for two weeks because she was afraid he was going to hurt her. She said that every time he reached into his backpack, she thought he was going to pull out a weapon. He was in her small group, so I moved him to a different group, and she returned to class with my encouragement.

Throughout the semester, numerous students—I believe a total of NINE—came to me with concerns about the student. I encouraged them to share their feelings with the Dean of Student Affairs and the Division Dean. These students felt, as did I, that the student could become violent. The students and I had the same experience; we were either ignored or made to feel that we were overreacting. I was told that it was a "classroom management" issue.

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

One day, I dismissed class early to avoid covering a topic that I knew would upset the student. The next class period, I called in sick because my anxiety was debilitating. When I finally covered the material, as I expected, he reacted with animosity. Although I eventually made it through that topic and the rest of the semester, every morning when I would say goodbye to my young child, I did so with the feeling that it might be the last time I saw him. This is how I came to work every day.

On the last day of the semester, when I hoped that this stressful situation was almost over, the student sent emails through Blackboard to three of the students in the class who had challenged his homophobic comments. Each message was tailored to the individual. He made comments such as

- “Someone needs to teach you a lesson that it’s not okay to single out students you disagree with.”
- “Someone needs to correct your behaviors.”
- “Someone needs to teach you that is unacceptable.”
- “You need to learn to not harass students you disagree with.”
- “Go find a basement, close the door behind you, and lock it.”
- “I do passionately hate people like you.”
- “I will never forgive you.”

Needless to say, the students who received the messages were very upset and frightened. They contacted me immediately, and I reported the emails. The recipients were given the opportunity to meet with the Dean of Student Affairs to discuss what happened. Two of the three did so. The other student was too scared. The student who sent the emails met with the Dean of Student Affairs and received a warning. He was also instructed that he should not be enrolled in any of the same classes as the other students in future semesters. The victims were assured that this student would not be in their classes. Unfortunately, on the first day of the fall semester, one of the victims, who identifies as gay and had been especially scared by the comments in class and the email from the perpetrator, came to me extremely upset because the student was in one of his classes. The Dean of Student Affairs should have made sure that this did not happen.

During the semester, and even after he received a warning, the student was disparaging me to other students, my dean, my colleagues and online. He posted many slanderous comments on the RateMyProfessors website that college students often use to make decisions about classes. I was concerned about the comments, not because I can’t take criticism, but because of the nature of the remarks, which dehumanized me, for example calling me “a disgusting slimeball and a miserable excuse of a decent human being.” Dehumanizing a person is almost always a precursor to committing violence. The two are intrinsically connected. I reported these comments to the College and was told that nothing could be done. When I returned to campus this fall, knowing that the student would be here, I asked if I could at least know his schedule in order to avoid him. My teaching schedule is easily available on WebAdvisor. Not only was I told that I could not have this information, I was questioned about my intent in asking for it

Although I am aware that this student has rights too, what continues to perplex me is that the rights of this one problem student seemed to trump the rights of the 30 other students in the class as well as the faculty member’s. Don’t we all have the right to a learning and work environment free of ridicule and hostility?

UPDATE 11/14/18

Two new comments have appeared this week, right after the RMP.com site lifted its requirement for students to register before rating me. This is one of the most frightening comments yet: “Shereen is a

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

terrible wicked evil person. She is discriminatory and manipulative. Everyone should know what a terrible anti American she is. She is anti free speech and hates conservatives. She deletes negative comments because she is weak and spineless. She is the worst professor at SCC! She is AWFUL!!" I believe that "anti American" is code for "brown person" or "Muslim." This language is extremely concerning.

D1

At the end of my, Professor Govea's, class one day, I noticed a student crying. After asking the student what was wrong, she explained a student who had walked by our classroom door appeared to flip her off. When asked for further details, the student stated she had exchanged number with the other student a week ago. He had begun texting her; her boyfriend called him to discuss his frequent texts to her, which we resulted in an argument. My student reported that after the argument, while she was on campus at a later date, that the other student had yelled to her, "Yo, tell that ***** that I'm gonna put a ***** bullet through his head." She stated the student had also muttered something to her in passing at a different time, as well.

These events were reported on Maxient. A week later, I was told in an email both students had met with the dean of discipline and had arrived at an amicable resolution and that a no-contact directed had been issued to both students. Later that day, I ran into my student, who was visibly distressed, prior to our class. She stated she did not feel the issue was resolved and that she felt as though she had been made to blame for what had occurred. When I told the student I would speak to my dean to discuss what next steps need be taken, she replied through tears that she did "not want anything to do with that dean." It was explained multiple deans work on campus. The student maintained that she did not want to deal with the dean with whom she had met, but understood further resolution she needed to be met. Later, the student told me she had been made to feel in her meeting that she was racist and had been asked if she was born in this country. The student did not understand why she was asked this question and stated the discipline process was more traumatizing for her than what had transpired with the alleged perpetrator.

Later that day, in our second consecutive class together, I noticed a student who walked past my classroom door several times. He caught my attention due to his multiple times passing by my classroom door and his gesticulating. After one of these passings, I made eye contact with my student, who, crying, nodded her head, which I confirmed to be a nonverbal affirmation that the passing student was the alleged perpetrator. Professor Gause, who taught across the hallway from me, had also noticed this student's behavior outside of my classroom; she stated he had stopped outside of my classroom door. It was unknown at the time if Professor Gause and I had observed the same behaviors at the same time.

A decision was made to move my class to a different classroom. I also filed another Maxient report, noting the student's multiple passings, as a no-contact directive had already been issued. In the report, I stated Professor Gause had observed the student's behavior. Professor Gause was asked for a time estimate of the student's passing; I was not. Professor Gause speculated she had observed the student between 11:50 and 11:57 a.m. Time estimates were not specified in my report.

At a later date, Dean Vakil emailed Professor Gause and I asked us to meet with him to review video footage of what had occurred in the hallway. In meeting with Dean Vakil, we were shown a video clip of the student's previous hallway behavior, which showed the student looking into each door of my classroom. This video footage appeared to be taken at 11:57 a.m. Upon reviewing this footage, Dean Vakil asked why the account of the events in my Maxient report differed from the behavior observed in the video; this had been discussed in his meeting with the Vice President of Student Services and the Assistant Dean of Discipline. It was explained that the behavior I observed occurred at a later time

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

in our class period than the behavior examined in the video tape; this time appeared to reflect those specified in Professor Gause's email, rather than my report. Dean Vakil recommended I file a subsequent Maxient report to clarify the details of my observations. This was completed; in it, I stated I did not specify in my original report the times at which I had observed the behavior, or the amount of times the student had passed by my classroom. It was further clarified that as my attention had been dedicated to my students and lesson, these observations had not been recorded.

I later received an email confirming the receipt of this update. I additionally was told by Professor Gause that the hallway footage had later been reviewed in its entirety and that the details of my report describing the student's multiple passings was now corroborated. It was later confirmed by Lieutenant Pacheco that the hallway footage had not initially been reviewed in its entirety. The 30 minutes before and after my class had begun had been reviewed; it did not appear that time during my class period had been reviewed.

After reviewing the footage in its entirety, the subsequent communication received from the Assistant Dean of Discipline, Lorretta Jordan, said that she spoke with the student about "dancing" in the hallways and how that can be distracting to others. She also mentioned that she would reiterate the no-contact order. The concern over a student violating a no-contact order was absent in her message. There was no action taken to reinforce the no-contact order. Everyone in the situation was left vulnerable.

The student then began lurking outside of Professor Tiffany Gause's classroom.

I, Professor Gause, witnessed the student stand outside my classroom for such a long period of time that I stepped outside to see if the student needed something. He replied that he was simply saying hi. I've never met this student, so it is odd that he would try to just say hi during class time. I told the student I needed him to go to class.

The next class period, the student walked into my class during the middle of my class. When I turned to see who it was standing behind me, I recognized him as the lurking student. I immediately told him to leave my class. He refused. I told him to leave my class 5 times, finally threatening to call security if he didn't leave. It was only when I walked to the classroom phone to call security that the student left. I sent a Maxient report in and I spoke with security. Other faculty members reported the student went into their offices and used a slur against me.

I received a subsequent communication that the student had been suspended. Both Professor Govea and I *still* don't know what the student was suspended for. Was it for the no-contact violation? Was it for entering a class and refusing to leave? Was it for using a slur? Were there two investigations, as these are two separate incidents?

We (Professor Govea and I) met with the Vice President of Student Affairs, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs (the VPAA presence was at our request). We shared our concerns, and our questions. We were assured we would receive answers, and we have not.

I was very concerned for what would happen when the student returned to campus. Would he escalate his behavior? He has already threatened to shoot someone, would he carry that out? The only response I got from the Assistant Dean of Discipline was that she spoke with the student and he promised he wouldn't disrupt again. This empty and inadequate communication left me with no sense of security. I ended up moving my classroom to an entirely different floor to protect my

SCC Academic Senate Minutes - DRAFT
November 20, 2018 1:30 – 3:00 A-211

students, and myself.

Because of the inadequate response by the Office of the Assistant Dean of Student Development, this student was able to disrupt two entire classes to the point that they had to be moved. Students in the classroom and in the hallways had to witness confrontation and student rants, other faculty were brought into the situation, and made to feel unsafe because of his anger.

The response of the office of the Assistant Dean of Student Development created more harm on our campus, not less. The students and faculty of SCC deserve more than what they got in this incident.

E1

I had a returning student in my class who instigated a shouting incident with another student in my class. There were threats of violence, but fortunately, the students left with no punches thrown. Soon after, the same student began asking questions leading me to believe he thought another student was poisoning him and the class. When I met with the student and a counselor in my office (Dr. Jordan couldn't make it at the last minute), the student made it clear that he thought a student was wearing "biological agents" on her body to poison us. In addition, he thought other students were following him in class, different ones each day. He also said that I was not keeping him safe in the classroom and SCC was also not keeping him safe. He planned to bring a device to test the air to class. He was intentionally vague about which students were following him. He said, very seriously, that he would do whatever he needed to do keep himself safe. Coming from a man who had already instigated what almost became a fistfight in my class, I was scared, mainly for the students he suspected of trying to harm him. The next day, he met with the higher-ups and was deemed not a threat. He was going to remain in my class, so I restructured my class to avoid all student-to-student interaction, in hopes of keeping the other students safer. I lectured; they worked individually. This continued until I withdrew him for attendance reasons. Question: Is there anything that can be done while the threats are still indirect?

Appendix B

Two club advisors met with Dr. Loretta Jordan regarding students' concerns about the way they were being treated by staff members. In a meeting with the advisors and staff to discuss the students' concerns with communication, Dr. Loretta Jordan took the meeting in an adversarial direction, and student concerns were not addressed.

Appendix C

Dear Senate

I am writing in response to the resolution of vote of no confidence against Lorrie Jordan. I for one am totally against this vote of no confidence because I do not believe that there is enough solid evidence for this vote. Yes, there was a survey that produced some personal sentiments of those who filled it out. However, I wrote many positive personal experiences and none were mentioned and there are others who also wrote positively in the survey, but their comments were also left out. In fact, I have participated for many years in students hearing and I have never experienced any wrong doing or felt that due process was not followed in those hearing, or the process before the hearing.

I believe that our college family, faculty, staff, administrators and students should attend the Student Discipline and the Law before making any assumptions on SCC process of student discipline. There was a training last month for two days and it is my understanding is that few attended. I believe the Senate should take leadership to ensure we all attend this training.

Faculty, I urge you to put this vote of no confidence completely off the table until we all attend the training on Student Discipline and the Law. Then you will be able to make an informed decision based on a comprehensive understanding of the complex issues involved in disciplining students, within the constraints of the law and education code.

Respectfully,
Nena