I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m. by Mr. Jackson the Board President. Those present were:

- Mr. Bob Arthur
- Dr. Bob Hughlett
- Ms. Carmen Avalos
- Mr. Tom Jackson
- Dr. Ted Edmiston
- Mr. John Moore
- Mr. Bob Epple
- Mr. Jason Macias, Student Trustee

Others present were the President of the College, Vice President of Business Services, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Student Services, Faculty Senate President and CSEA President.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The flag salute was led by Mr. Arthur.

III. MINUTES

November 7, 2007

It was moved by Dr. Edmiston and seconded by Mr. Epple to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 7, 2007. The vote for approval was unanimous.

IV. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mark Fronke

Mr. Fronke spoke as a member of the Business Division faculty regarding communication between the administration and faculty. He expressed frustration that in a publication that was released last summer, the Business Division building was not listed as one of the construction priorities on campus. He stated that he was a member of the committee who prepared the Education Facilities Master Plan in 1997 and questioned the process in which the building priorities had changed since then. He stated that he never received a response from the Dean, Vice President or President. He stated that Mr. Farmer came to the Business division and spoke about changes to the master plan which had a domino effect that affected the Business division building. Mr. Fronke stated that he attended an accreditation forum and expressed concerns about the process and questioned why a long-standing faculty member was not aware of the changes in the document. He also questioned if there was a shared governance process and wished to know who was involved. He stated that he still has not received an answer. Mr. Fronke then expressed frustration with the process of hiring a dean for the Business division. He stated that although the division has not had a dean for three years, Dr. Vela nor Mr. Farmer has met with the Business division to communicate information about that process. He also stated that faculty members have spent hours going through the screening and interview process to select new faculty members and then are told by the President’s Office that no one will be hired. He stated that the college could have a very robust Accounting program but we must have more full-time faculty. Mr. Fronke concluded by stating that these are just examples of where faculty feels like this administration does not communicate properly and he added that there is no interest in building any rapport with the faculty.

After discussion amongst the Board, it was agreed that the limitation of five minutes per speaker would be waived so that the Board could hear all of the concerns being brought by the speakers. Mr. Jackson requested that the speakers be mindful of the time when speaking.
Mr. McPherson, HPEA faculty member, stated that when the original master plan (1997) was conceived it was a formal shared governance process. He stated that he was very involved in that process and each department was asked to justify why they should be on the master plan. He added that the focus was the campus needs within the community and stated that growth and enrollment was an issue. He stated that the HPEA division focused on that master plan in terms of surface area because those are considered classrooms. He stated that another focus was on fitness for the elderly population, adaptive population and the general student body population. He stated this focus provided the college with a broad base of connecting to the community to increase enrollment. He added that another issue was the overall fitness of the nation. He also spoke about how the department secured a beverage agreement for the college which provided new scoreboards for the teams. He discussed how the HPEA division played an important role in initiating the partnership with the Southland Motor Car Dealers Association as a means to trying to connect to the community and increase enrollment. He stated that the division also managed the College Bound program, which offers high school courses on college campuses. He stated that $2.9 million was funded to the college for this project. Mr. McPherson also stated that the HPEA division provided assistance to the Foundation in securing Board members. He stated that this accomplishment played a role in passing the GO bond. The department had an IPP into the state in 1998. He stated that he believes their efforts warrant faculty to have input in their area and added that he didn’t believe that they were heard. He concluded by stating that for this institution to move forward, faculty and employees need to be involved in the process.

Ms. Prindle stated that she believes the HPEA division has sent a clear and consistent message to the administration for several years about the instructional needs of the division and the potential growth of the college. She distributed a timeline to show the efforts to make the Health and Wellness complex based on their vision. She stated that the division prepared an IPP for an adapted PE complex in 1998. She stated that in 2003, the master plan was updated to indicate a new construction of this building and in 2004 it was a priority in the GO bond project. She stated that in 2005, the division was asked to present a document comparing field space with other colleges. She stated that the division was then informed that they would lose their current soccer field for a child care center and parking lot and four tennis courts for a parking lot after the new soccer field is complete. She stated that the division was also told that the Health and Wellness complex was not going to be funded by the current GO bond, which was devastating to the division. She stated that a letter was sent to the Board in November 2005 which was signed by the entire division, and yet the division did not receive a response. She stated that in December 2006 an e-mail was sent to administration with information regarding expected growth if the building was constructed, but little or no response was received. Ms. Prindle stated that the division believes the master plan should have some focus on growth for the college, yet their ideas have been ignored. She concluded by stating that the division would like to know what they need to do to get faculty input and a sense of shared governance in the decisions that affect us all.
Ms. Jensen stated that she would like to address a partial list of violations of shared governance as they relate to the issues that the PE division is experiencing. She addressed the loss of instructional space where a grassy field is now being used to build a central plant. She stated that the area was used by the softball team, baseball team, women’s soccer team, soccer classes, track and field, fitness and golf classes, fundraising events and tournaments. She stated that faculty was told the space was taken away because they thought it wasn’t being used, but she added that faculty was never asked. She stated that the HPEA division is losing the soccer field, which will become a parking lot. She added that this field is currently used by men’s and women’s soccer teams, football teams, softball, men’s and women’s basketball, track and field, weight training classes, fitness, golf and soccer classes. She stated that the division will be losing four tennis courts for another parking lot. She stated that while one of the main reasons for losing space is to provide more parking, a survey done by faculty found over 1,200 open spots. She added that the loss of instructional space is a heavy price to pay when one considers that the college has a strawberry field that is undeveloped. Ms. Jensen stated that another item of concern is the budget. She stated that HPEA has consistently been denied requests to review the cost of their projects. She stated that they have not received any budget information on projects until last week when they were given a copy of the field’s budget. She stated that they have no idea how money is being spent and have dozens of change orders that have not been signed off by the user groups. She stated that a second season of football has been completed on the new field yet we have not yet signed off on the field because there are still items that need to be fixed. She stated that track and field will begin its second season on the new track, but it has not been signed off because it has items that need to be attended to as well. She stated that users have been left out of the decision making process. Ms. Jensen also discussed the fact that the college has no plans for future maintenance on new facilities. She stated that without a maintenance plan, it is nearly impossible to keep the facilities up to a high standard. She stated that the college has a state-of-the-art new track that has only been washed down once in the past year because cleaning equipment was not purchased. She added that the football field needs repair work done to the seams that are coming apart at the middle of the field and added that while it is still under warranty, there is concern regarding future repair costs when the warranty runs out. Ms. Jensen concluded by stating that this is just a partial list of examples that detail some of the concerns and issues.

Ms. Welliver stated that in HPEA, faculty members are facilities-driven. She stated that the college has full-time students that attend because of our facilities and added that there has been a lack of communication and shared governance pertaining to the construction projects in the HPEA area. She questioned why field space is being taken for a non-instructional building which includes a fence that is too close to the softball field. She stated that the faculty has come up with some action items for the Board to consider. She stated that HPEA must not lose any more instructional space and added that since the start of the college no one has taken away instructional space. She stated that the work on the soccer field needs to stop immediately so faculty can take a look at things. She stated that HPEA faculty feels like the general user group
needs to be informed or consulted on major decisions and change orders, which is a matter of shared governance. She stated that maintenance plans must be developed and requested better communication with the College Committee on Campus Transformation. She stated that the Health and Wellness complex needs to be back to its original scope. She concluded by inviting the Board to meet with the HPEA faculty to allow time to talk about everything.

Dr. Piorkowski stated that speaking to the Board was difficult because some of the points she would speak of refuted information that the Board received from individuals that she truly respects. She stated that she has been a co-chair on the College Accreditation Committee three times and added that most recently she is the co-chair of Standard II with Dr. Johnson. She stated that the report should be based on campus-wide input but stated that committees have never seen the abstracts that the Board received. She stated that committees also did not receive the Noel-Levitz survey data until after all the self-study drafts were submitted, revised, reviewed and finalized in meetings in April and May. She added that the committee members did not see the minutes of the meetings until last Friday when they were sent as a memo and e-mail attachment. She stated that while the memo read that only five points in Standard IV had major differences with the rewrite, those points compose 20 percent of Standard IV. She stated that the Noel-Levitz data shows that five of the nine challenges identified by the staff pertained to administration and governance, but that the memo points out that those five challenges were on the positive side when they were only 0.2 or 0.8 above the midpoint. She also commented that it wasn’t noted that those ratings were among the lowest in the entire report of data gathered by both students and staff. She also spoke regarding the templates for the accreditation self-study. She stated that while Standard IV did not follow the templates, they saved a lot of extra work by not doing so. Dr. Piorkowski stated that at the final review meetings, the committee was told that all points agreed to in the final meetings would be inserted by the final writer. She stated that Standard II, wishing to make sure that the edits were accurate, inserted their own revisions. She stated that while a memo to the Board stated that committee members were notified that the Noel-Levitz data was requested to be included in the draft, that information was not correct. She stated that an e-mail of the results was only sent to the overall chairs. She clarified that Standard II did insert some of the Noel-Levitz data because they were waiting to get the data to insert the responses. She stated that she had several other points of differences and would be happy to answer questions at a later time. She concluded by questioning why the Standard IV data did not include mention of the Noel-Levitz data such as the indication that employees do not perceive the current campus environment as being supportive of empowerment or innovation.

Mr. Chester reminded the Board that over a year ago, he told a story to the Board and asked them to listen to other people’s stories. He stated that he didn’t have enough time to tell the Board all of the things that he thinks are wrong with Cerritos College these days. He stated that he does not feel that people know what the agenda is at Cerritos College. He stated that Dr. Reece’s agenda for student success is something that people are interested in supporting. Mr. Chester also stated that the stories faculty members are relaying all involve leadership. He stated
that people recognize leadership when they see it and when they don’t see it. He asked the Board to consider the fact that the stories tell the Board that there is nobody following the so-called leadership, and therein lies the problem. He spoke to the Vice Presidents and extended sympathy and added that the faculty knows they are working hard, but added that loss and making good time is not enough. He stated that people are lost. He concluded by stating that when it comes time for the Vice Presidents to tell their stories, he would urge them to tell it truthfully.

Mr. Huber spoke on behalf of the Fine Arts faculty. He stated that in August 2006, a special presentation by the President was made concerning new Fine Arts buildings. At that presentation, he stated that the division was shown the latest revision to the campus master plan with the focus on the proposed Burnight Center replacement. He stated that overall the presentation was very vivid and exciting but that the feeling afterward was mixed. He stated that based on the President’s assurances, the faculty understood that some action on the project was going to start soon. However, he stated that the faculty was dismayed over the fact that planning had progressed to this level (IPP submitted to state) without any input from those of us who would live in it. Mr. Huber stated that after the Board approved the new master plan, it was revealed that not only was the new Burnight Center not imminent, but it was not even on any state list for funding. He stated that it is the consensus of the Fine Arts faculty that they were given false hopes although it would appear that the plan had palpable faculty support when it was presented to them for approval. He added that while the dean was brought in to sit in as the sole representative of the Fine Arts users during the IPP development process, she was only a probationary employee at the time. He added that none of the stakeholders were asked about needs or ideas. He asked the Board why no user input was received and if the revision was being done in secret. He concluded by stating that the Fine Arts faculty believe that critical decisions that directly affect the mission to teach Fine Arts effectively were made behind closed doors and that the division had no input. He added that they feel this is the antithesis of effective shared governance and it needs to be corrected.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Mr. Jackson opened discussion regarding the certification of the Accreditation Self-Study. Mr. Farmer stated that at the last Board meeting on November 7, the Board asked the self-study co-chairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer to work with the original Standard IV committee to reconcile the two versions of the self-study report. He indicated that the Board was informed by a letter on November 7 that the administrative co-chair of the committee declined to work with the group although the faculty co-chair was willing to and did assist in the work that was completed. Mr. Farmer stated that an effort was made to re-insert more of the language of the original version of Standard IV while still producing an evidence-based report that is responsive to the standards. He explained that the challenges with Standard IV as submitted included conclusions with no supporting evidence and inaccurate statements. He indicated they found twenty conclusions that were presented with no supporting evidence. He indicated that the original version cited only eighteen and the revised version cited fifty-five pieces of evidence. He reported that there were eight statements that were factually
wrong, two of which materially affected the conclusion drawn in Standard IV. He said they found fifteen statements that had been rendered inoperative because the recent shared governance review and updated policies and procedures had corrected the events described as problems. He further stated that they found five sections where the document did not address the issues in the standard and found nine unclear or contradictory statements. He shared that he and the co-Chairs had served on a total of six accrediting teams in recent years and have experience in evaluating colleges under the present standards. He stated that the group reviewed the commission’s definitions of evidence and applied them to the original version of Standard IV. He clarified that the group was not attempting to protect the college, protect the President, or to protect senior administrators from criticism. Instead, they made an effort to ensure that when statements were made, either critical or laudatory, they were supported by evidence. Their responsibility as co-Chairs and ALO was to correct the problem and produce an evidence-based report that was responsive to the standards. Mr. Farmer stated that this issue has had a positive outcome because most of the campus has a greater awareness that an accreditation visit is approaching. He added that they have also begun a dialogue about processes surrounding leadership and governance at Cerritos College. Finally, he stated that this issue has pointed out the lack of evidence we have about the quality of decision-making at Cerritos College. He credited Mr. Fronke for bringing up this issue and stated that one of the planning agendas added to the revision says that the college should develop systematic processes and timelines to evaluate its decision-making at all levels in order to be able to improve if necessary, in this area. Mr. Farmer concluded by presenting four options to the Board: 1. Adopt the self-study with the original version of Standard IV’s self-study. 2. Adopt the self-study with the editing team’s first version of the Standard IV Self-Study. 3. Adopt the self-study with the editing team’s second version of the Standard IV Self-Study. 4. Adopt the self-study with Dr. Hughlett’s second revised version of Standard IV Self-Study. He added that the editing team recommends the third option because it blends the two versions and yields an evidence-based document responsive to the ACCJC standards.

Mr. Epple sought to clarify whether the accrediting team will seek evidence such as the items the Board has seen, and most likely all those items not just those in the certified copy, when there’s an indication of dissatisfaction of the official certified reports. He wanted to know if they will also talk to people. Mr. Farmer replied that the teams do attempt to find evidence for all assertions in the self-study and added that if it is not presented they will look for it. He stated that teams will typically interview all of the standard co-Chairs, the President, the Vice Presidents, the ALO, the self-study co-Chairs, and will also conduct open meetings for anybody to give information for anything regarding accreditation.
Dr. Hughlett stated that he would like to hear Dr. Reece speak on the issue. He indicated that he created a version of the Standard IV Self-Study that was a cut and paste version which combined information from the first and third versions of the document. He stated that the third revision was a much closer attempt but that it was not totally honest, and added that he wants a report that’s as honest as can be. He also indicated that it is probable that the conclusions made by the committee in the original document regarding the governance of the institution may be supportable by arguments that are not identified at the moment. He concluded by stating that he would feel adequate supporting his revision as a Board member because it is an honest portrayal of the situation at Cerritos College.

Dr. Reece stated that it is has been said many times in Faculty Senate that they would like to see this administration focus more on an academic and teaching and learning agenda. He stated that he appreciated the hard work that Mr. Farmer and the committee did but still thinks the process is a mess. He added that while Mr. Farmer is stating that the changes made to the document were reasonable changes, there are long-standing members of the college who are in serious disagreement. Dr. Reece expressed that people routinely feel excluded from the decision-making processes on campus. He indicated that he thinks there are two reasons this issue has become such a flashpoint. First, he stated that while the revised document is a very positive document, it stands in stark contrast to other issues going on now such as the recent fact that Faculty Senate will be deliberating on a vote of no confidence. Second, he stated that this issue is an example where people feel like major decisions are often being made on campus without stakeholder input. He stated that they often feel as if they are being informed about decisions that have already been made and that their involvement has been mischaracterized as shared governance input. He said that the first revision of the document was given to the Board as though there was consensus in the community; as though it had been adopted through some kind of shared governance process. He added that for many people on campus, this issue has been the last straw of many other straws that had the same kind of theme about exclusionary decision-making on campus.

Mr. Epple indicated that Dr. Reece’s comments were not a response to Dr. Hughlett’s question and he asked for clarification regarding how Dr. Reece felt toward Dr. Hughlett’s suggested document. Dr. Reece replied that the Senate was very specific about how he was to reply. He would need to contact all the co-chairs and ask them if the revised document agrees with the original document. He didn’t think the five members on the committee participated upfront. He had not heard from the whole committee and indicated he wished he could be more specific but that personally, he would prefer to go with Dr. Hughlett’s version which incorporates the changes.
Mr. Epple asked Mr. Farmer if any of the statements in Dr. Hughlett’s version were contrary to the facts. Mr. Farmer replied that there were a couple, but added that they would need some direction on several items such as the green comments on page five. He said there is a statement on page 18 that says equipment budgets were decreased dramatically to enable a 2006 pilot run of the capital outlay request process, however, he indicated that this was accomplished with an extra funding source so that equipment funds were not diminished that year. He stated that in the document, there was a statement regarding the composition of the Strategic Plan Committee not being represented by identified constituent groups. He indicated that both Mr. Livingston and Dr. Rose were on the committee and they recalled that Bob Chester was also on the committee while he served as Faculty Senate President. He added that their memory was that there was constituent representation and that the committee has had changes in membership but the final membership listed included eight administrators, four faculty members and one classified staff member. He ended by saying that with the exception of those places where factual errors needed to be corrected, they could live with Dr. Hughlett’s version.

Mr. Jackson acknowledged Jenine Nolan, who was present in the audience. Ms. Nolan stated that she did in fact send a memo to the Board declining involvement in further revisions of Standard IV because she felt the original version was a fair report. She explained that had she been approached, she would have worked to complete the document because it needs to be completed. She stated that the fact that there is conflict over Standard IV validates many of the statements made in the document. She stated that she felt the third version omits major concerns expressed in the original Standard IV version. She stated that she hadn’t had time to read Dr. Hughlett’s version in detail but at first glance, she approved of the document. She added that this is an institutional document and it is past one person’s opinion. She said that as for IV.B.2.a, the issue that’s been said about the equipment budget, it’s been said a couple of times that the budgets were not decreased but it was her recollection that division budgets were deeply decreased to run the capital outlay request. Ms. Higdon indicated to Ms. Nolan that there was no decrease for the pilot run. Ms. Nolan then replied that the word “pilot” should be removed. Ms. Nolan stated that it is a fact that ACCME did not name any members to the Strategic Planning committee prior to the newest revision of the process when the College Coordinating Committee reviewed it.

Mr. Moore stated that at this point, he doesn’t believe full approval will be given on any version of the documents. He expressed interest in Dr. Reece’s comment that not all of the committee members had a chance to review the third and fourth versions of the document or had participated up front. Dr. Reece stated that it was his understanding that each of the committee members were to meet and prepare a revised version but that it didn’t happen. Mr. Moore expressed concern over the Board’s involvement in the process and noted that while he understands Dr. Hughlett has good intentions,
the campus should resolve the issue and bring it back to the Board and say they support it, have worked out the differences and can stand behind the document when the team arrives. He indicated that he did not feel the Board should get involved in something that the campus should resolve.

Dr. Hughlett clarified that he didn’t write any of the document that he prepared and noted that it was a cut and paste of two versions of the document. He stated that there is a growing sense of urgency to finalize this document so that it can be certified and delivered. Mr. Epple stated that the entire committee needs to meet and come to an agreement. He stated that the administration should meet with the subcommittee and that it is a professional responsibility for that subcommittee to meet. He added that he preferred that it be completed before the next Board meeting.

Mr. Arthur stated that this meeting has been very informative and he thanked Dr. Hughlett for his diligent work preparing a version of the Standard IV self-study. He acknowledged Dr. Reece and staff for their leadership in this issue. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Moore and Mr. Epple in that the document should go back to the community for consensus and then brought back to the Board. He added that when he read the first two documents, he was shocked at the differences between the two.

Mr. Macias asked what would be so hard about sending the original document. Mr. Jackson replied that the original document was not quite complete.

Ms. Avalos thanked everyone for taking time to be here tonight. She stated that she had concerns and hears two sides. She stated that it’s difficult to understand why there is a difference when all that is being asked for is sincerity and honesty in a report. She thanked Dr. Hughlett for putting his document together but did not think that the Board should have any involvement whatsoever. She added that the institution can only learn from a document that is honest. Ms. Avalos said she would be embarrassed if something was certified and then proven insincere. She stated that she is very disappointed in observing the occurrence of power plays and added that she didn’t think that Standard IV is an opportunity to evaluate a President or management. She added that if people are disappointed, they should come to the evaluation sessions and voice their concerns there. She indicated that it appears that there are many issues that could have been discussed prior to tonight. She indicated that she was hearing complaints about things that could and should have been brought up before and wondered why they were being brought up with this document.

There was considerable discussion regarding when the Board would consider certification of the Accreditation Self-Study. After discussion, it was generally agreed that an agenda item would be placed on the December 12 Board consent agenda.
Mr. Jackson acknowledged Mr. Chester, who was present in the audience and wished to speak. Mr. Chester stated that if he were the co-chair of Standard IV and there were questions on items that were submitted, he would fully expect that someone would contact him for clarification and feedback.

Dr. Reece stated he wanted to respond to Ms. Avalos and further stated that shared governance states that whenever there is an academic or professional matter that’s discussed, the faculty must be included in that discussion. He stated that the reason there is not agreement on this issue is that the college is not using the shared governance process. He expressed deep concern over the editing decisions made over the summer in which the committee wasn’t consulted.

Ms. Avalos responded to Dr. Reece stating that she sees things very clearly. She said that we’re blaming other people for things we should be doing anyway. She added that we’re really not sharing that governance, we’re pointing the finger. She stated that perhaps the Board should consider involving a third party to address the issues on campus. Dr. Hughlett stated that there are deeper issues involving trust and communication which are leading to so many other things and added that the Board needs to start looking at these issues in the near future.

Mr. Epple stated that while one of the complaints is that people aren’t allowed to participate in the process, all of the items talked about tonight have been items that were agendized and minutes have been posted and mailed to the community. He added that meetings have been included on the college calendar of events and yet there are a lot of people here tonight, two years too late, to object to things that were done. He expressed that one of the problems we have is that there is only an interest when there’s another reason for what’s coming forward. He stated that people need to participate at the time the items come up, not when it’s convenient.

The Board took a ten-minute recess and reconvened at 7:30 p.m.

B. Mr. Jackson invited discussion regarding concerns expressed by the HPEA Faculty. Mr. Epple asked for information regarding the meetings notes that were received by the Board. Ms. Higdon stated that since information wasn’t received regarding the specific issues of the HPEA faculty, staff put together notes from any meetings that occurred regarding HPEA issues. She noted that information was not included from the campus forums that were done in 2005 or the actual Board agenda items. She provided a summary of the minutes of meetings regarding HPEA. She discussed the original 2003 vision for a parking garage which was at a cost of about $17 million in today’s dollars and added that staff sought to seek alternate parking resolutions to avoid that cost. She stated that staff tried to look at every surface space to see if it could be turned into parking. She stated that there appeared to be a lot of land devoted to outdoor PE activities at that point in time. She stated that Dr. Dan Smith conducted a survey of approximately seventeen local community
colleges and found that only one college had more surface athletic space than Cerritos College. That was Mt. San Antonio College, which has 420 acres. She stated that was what drove the issue of figuring out if there was a way to more effectively use exterior spaces in the athletic area to try to accommodate all instructional programs. She said that there were communications between the Facilities staff and the PE department, as indicated in the August 23 meeting. She stated that communication is in the eyes of beholder and what one person may think is a directive versus what is a give-and-take discussion would depend on who was experiencing it at the moment. She indicated that two meetings where items were discussed took place in 2005 and now that the time has come to turn the old soccer field into parking, it is unsettling to the PE faculty and they want the issue to be brought to everyone’s attention again. She explained that there was representation from the HPEA division at the meetings that occurred, as well as representation from the Board and Faculty Senate. Every item that was represented in the minutes involves the PE area. She reviewed the items covered and the participants at each meeting. She indicated that there was a sincere effort made to get the items on the agenda. She stated that more could be done and that the makeup of the committee would be discussed at the next committee meeting. She stated she was a little disturbed when the impression left was that the opportunity isn’t there for people to bring things forward.

Dr. Reece stated that while faculty members have stated that some of the developments have been positive, there are other developments going on that HPEA faculty believe hurt programs. He added that he was present when Ms. Higdon visited Faculty Senate, a division meeting and a College Committee on Campus Transformation meeting and he witnessed faculty members who felt that they have not been involved in the process. He stated that they don’t understand the progress being made when it’s hurting the program. Dr. Reece stated that he believed the College Committee on Campus Transformation meets infrequently and added that they should meet once or twice a month. He added that those meetings are updates rather than input processes.

Ms. Higdon responded by saying that they will try hard to be more open but takes issue with the fact that people say they didn’t know what was going on. She further stated that they may not be accepting of what is going on, but they have known it.

Dr. Hughlett asked for clarification about ongoing maintenance and the fence around the proposed central plant which is located in close proximity to the softball field. Mr. Riffle stated that with respect to maintenance, the track has been cleaned and will be cleaned prior to functions as needed.

Ms. Higdon stated that the issue of the central plant was discussed in great detail during College Committee on Campus Transformation meetings as shown in the minutes. She shared that the central plant is close to the pool because the waste heat will heat the pool to
reduce costs. She indicated that the faculty feels that the location of the fence would be too close to the edge of their field. She indicated that while that remains to be seen, they are looking at the situation closely and may move the fence back to ensure a safe solution.

Dr. Hughlett asked about the loss of instructional space as it pertains to the playing fields. Ms. Higdon stated that the construction will greatly extend the use of very large instructional space. Ms. Higdon went to the Master Plan hanging on the wall and showed an area – open field – that people tonight said was heavily used. She said that they had been told it was seldom used. She added that parking that was not used because it was far is now a very nice throws area that is well-used. She shared that 64 parking spaces were lost to the throws area and 90 to the pool. Converting four underutilized tennis counts provides 148 parking spaces. Dr. Edmiston indicated that parking was a very high priority for the students and for years it was a large reason why they didn’t attend Cerritos College. He stated that students don’t want to walk long distances in the dark to reach their vehicle. He stated that as changes are being made to develop the campus, the scenario constantly changes as better opportunities present themselves. He stated that there can many solutions to address parking and added that the current plan does it very well with a cost of one field.

Dr. Reece underscored that the HPEA faculty is not asking for more money and added that they feel the current plan will decrease their instructional capacity. He stated that they are asking for an opportunity to redesign how the money is spent to offer more programs for students. He stated that Board policy dictates that they defer to faculty on instructional development and the HPEA faculty feels that their right to determine what the instructional development will be is being denied.

Mr. Epple asked where the college will stand in terms of field space after the construction changes take place. Ms. Higdon stated we will be around sixth in comparison with the colleges studied in the previous survey.

Mr. Epple expressed concern over the fact that the master plan is considered by the Board every year yet no one has come to the Board at that time to address their concerns. He added that part of shared governance is making sure that everyone knows what is happening and he stated that there has been a failure for at least the last five years to discuss those issues that have been on each of the master plans. He said that when the master plan is being considered there is an opportunity to discuss these issues. He said, “Don’t come back later and say, Oh, we want to reopen this despite the fact that the plans are made and the entire campus has an expectation held, and now we want to go a different direction.”

Mr. Arthur asked for clarification regarding change orders and whether they are given to the division for approval. Ms. Higdon stated that a user group would never get involved with a change
order unless it was something monumental. Mr. Riffle did not recollect this ever happening. He stated in connection with Bovis Lend Lease, the user groups sign off at every level on the general design. He added that if things change in the process, it is brought back.

Dr. Edmiston asked if the repair of the football field was part of the normal operation. Ms. Higdon stated that it is considered warranty work and that a healthy contingency is still sitting on the books.

Mr. Arthur said that earlier a question was raised to stop work and asked what work was underway with the fields. Ms. Higdon responded that work could not be stopped due to the contract. She further stated that she assumed that the earlier statement was a request to not turn the existing soccer field to parking when the new soccer field is complete. She continued with information in the Environmental Impact Study stating we had a 1:5 parking ratio in the plan. She indicated that with the construction and staging for it, approximately 300 parking spaces will be displaced. She said that while the soccer field conversion to parking could be delayed a bit, eventually the college must meet the ratio in the EIR and master plan.

Dr. Hughlett asked if there was a website established to provide information regarding construction projects on campus. Ms. Higdon stated that a preview website will be shown during the College Committee on Campus Transformation meeting on Thursday.

Mr. Arthur stated that while there were a lot of issues discussed, the main issue dealt with communication. He indicated that he hoped staff would meet with the HPEA faculty and garner as much input as possible. He added that if changes can be made without a great deal of interruption, the changes should come back to the Board. He concluded by stating that he would like to see staff take corrective measures and improve dialogue.

VI. ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

VII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees is scheduled for Wednesday, December 12, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

__________________________________________
Tom Jackson, President

__________________________________________
Robert Epple, Secretary