## OFFICIAL MINUTES

### Cerritos College

*Faculty Senate*

**Regular Meeting • November 3, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Breit</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Chalmers</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ernest</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Fabish</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Fernandez</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Fobi</td>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Hallinger</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Gersitz</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Hoppe-Nagao</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Liberal Arts (Vice President)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Hu</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Jensen</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Johnson</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Juntilla</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Lewellen</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X LoVetere</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Marks</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A McPherson</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Mellas</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Moore</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Library (President)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Moriarty</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X O'Neil</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Obasohan</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Page</td>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Real</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Silva</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Student Liaison (Non Voting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Soden</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Soto</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Stolze</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>CCFF Liaison (Non Voting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ukita</td>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>Counseling (Secretary)</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Wedell</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E White</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Wilson</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Wilson</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: Linda Lacy, Bill Farmer, M.L. Bettino, Gary Cain, David Young, Lee Krichmar, Michelle Kingston, Oscar Franco, Felipe Grimaldo, Rosa Castaneda, Megan Winters (Talon Net, Students ASCC)
MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting began at 11:09 a.m. The flag salute was led by President Lacy.

REPORTS

President Moore reported:

- The newly formed Accreditation Committee will meet on Thursday, Nov. 5th at 9:30 a.m.
- Because it seemed that the posting of the VP for Business Services position was not widely known, she recently asked that any new positions that are posted be announced at Coordinating Committee meeting.
- The Planning & Budget Committee had previously asked the Educational Master Plan taskforce to work on the college strategic goals (and plan?). The taskforce will present at the Planning & Budget Committee meeting on Thursday, November 5th. The meeting starts at 2:00 p.m., and will be in the Boardroom.

Vice President Hoppe-Nagao brought back information from the Curriculum Committee about making classes inactive. She reported that making a class inactive is a simple matter of checking off a box on a form. To reactivate a class, there is another box to check, and the class will have to go back through the committee with any updates that would normally be made to the outline, such as updating textbooks and other relevant course materials. Vice President Hoppe-Nagao suggested that if there is a chance that a department would want to offer a class within a few years, then it might not want to inactivate it.

President Stolze reported that the CCFF membership voted overwhelmingly in favor of ratifying the tentative agreement. He expressed his hope that the Board will approve it at its next meeting. If the Board approves it, the CCFF’s main task will be to work on transferring the relevant portions of the faculty handbook into the contract, which would dramatically increase the size of the contract. Then, they will have to schedule bargaining sessions for 2009-2010. In response to questions directed to him, President Stolze explained that there will still be a faculty handbook, but perhaps only about a third of the current handbook might remain in the handbook. Items that would get transferred to the contract would include any references to leaves and faculty service areas. President Moore acknowledged that what remains in the handbook will need to be revised and updated by the Senate.

Mr. Silva made the following announcements:

- Applications for the leadership conference (January 5-7, 2010) are currently available. There is limited space available. A $50 cash deposit is required.
Awards applications are available at Student Activities and online. They are due November 12th at 4:00 p.m.

The canned food drive is currently taking place. Ten canned goods will get a student one Show Pride point.

There will be an awards committee meeting on Tuesday, November 10th at 11:00 a.m. in BK 111/112.

Mr. Silva also thanked the students who attended the previous Faculty Senate meeting to show support for the proposal of having student representation on faculty hiring committees.

College President

President Lacy noted that it is election day, and that three Board of Trustees seat are open. She reported that there will be at least two more Board meetings this year: November 4th and December 9th. Additionally, President Lacy applauded the efforts of those who have worked on the Student Success Plan. She shared her observation that it is well-developed and there was a lot of interaction.

APPOINTMENTS AND NOMINATIONS

Committee Vacancies

The Program Review Committee still needs representatives from the Fine Arts/Communications and Health, Physical Education and Athletics divisions.

Committee Appointments

President Moore reminded the body that the Developmental Education Committee was approved to add two faculty positions to represent Career/Technical Education.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden and seconded by Senator Mellas to approve Charlene Fobi to serve on the Developmental Education committee.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

One more CTE faculty member is needed. The committee meets on the first and third Tuesdays of each month from 2:00 – 3:30.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION ITEMS

Nominations for Outstanding Faculty

Boxes have been set up around campus to receive nomination forms. The form can be downloaded from the Senate website, but it still has to be printed out and placed in one of the boxes.

Plenary Session Resolutions

Senator Soden will be attending the fall plenary session of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges. She will serve as Cerritos College’s delegate to vote on the resolutions. The senators were encouraged to look at the resolutions, which may be found on the ASCCC website, and to provide Senator Soden with input with respect to how they would like her to vote. She also asked that the senators let her know if there is anything in particular they would like her to obtain information on while at the session.

Other Announcements

President Moore announced that the Student Success taskforce will hold its final meeting on Wednesday, November 4th at 3:30 p.m. in LC 135. The current version of the plan may be found on the Senate website.
plan will come back to the Senate for a vote on November 10th.

SENATE DISCUSSION
EEOAC Draft Selection Procedures

An updated copy of comments compiled by President Moore pertaining to the draft of full-time faculty selection procedures was distributed, as was an updated draft of the procedures, which the ad hoc committee of Senator Juntilla, President Moore, Vice President Hoppe-Nagao and Secretary Ukita worked on. President Moore noted most of the comments that had been submitted made it into the draft. She then proceeded to lead the senators through a review of recommended changes proposed by the ad hoc committee, starting with areas—based on the feedback provided by faculty—that seemed to be widely agreed upon. Noting that much time was spent at the previous meeting on the first several pages of the drafted procedures, President Moore expressed her hope that starting on areas in which there appeared to be much agreement would allow the body to get through more of the document. The Senate was quickly able to move through the following:

- There was consensus among the senators that the phrase “in ranked or unranked order” should be included in section 13.9.
- Suggested revision: Add “at least” to line 42, page 20.
- There was no objection to recommended changes to page 21, which address what would take place if the selection committee cannot recommend at least three finalists. The main changes in this area include requiring the President/Superintendent to provide a written statement to explain why the forwarded candidates are not satisfactory; not allowing the President/Superintendent to go back into the pool and invite additional candidates not forwarded by the committee; and requiring the President/Superintendent to meet with the selection committee to explain reason(s) if he or she decides to close the recruitment process without making a recommendation for employment.
- Additional clarification needed from Human Resources with respect to the words “substantial” and “bias” in section 14.
- Suggested revision: Delete “etc.” at the end of line 17, page 22.

Movement through the document slowed down considerably once attention was directed to section 15. The recommendations that the ad hoc committee presented in this section, which speaks to the composition of the final interview committee, include: Including the division dean/area manager rather than the appropriate vice president, and adding a non-voting process monitor. This recommendation prompted much discussion, and culminated in several straw polls:

- The vice president has sat in on the final interviews in the past (and it is currently this way); however, a couple of senators recalled that was not necessarily the case prior to 1991.
- The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) paper on faculty hiring procedures identifies participation of the area administrator rather than the vice president.
- President Lacy shared her preference for including the vice president, because he or she will work with all faculty; the process monitor could be eliminated.
- An example was offered in which the college president at the time was given very different points of view from the dean and the selection committee chairperson who was a faculty member. Hope
was expressed that the president would listen to the committee chairperson.

- It was asserted that the position of the ASCCC is that faculty hiring is a faculty led process, and that unless there are some extreme circumstances, the president is there to affirm the selection committees’ selections.

- Vice President Farmer likened the process to getting married after a couple of blind dates. He shared his experience in sitting on final interviews in which representatives from the first level interviews saw something they had not seen previously. He disclosed that he has never been in a (final) committee in which the administrator went against the faculty or the first level committee, and emphasized that they are trying to find the best candidate who fits best with the students, divisions, and college. He also shared that at the second level interview, they are looking for who will be a good fit with the college as a whole—who will be a good citizen of the college and contribute to the college as a whole, and who might bring other qualities in addition to their discipline expertise. He encouraged a collaborative approach to the process.

- As long as the committee chairperson is a faculty member, the interests of the faculty should be represented at the second level. The faculty members (chairpersons) need to make sure they speak up at the second level.

- One of the charges to the first level committee is to send qualified candidates. They should not send candidates forward if they are not qualified.

- President Lacy supported Vice President Farmer’s understanding that at the second level, they are trying to get a better sense of fit. They also do not have to be as rigid with respect to working off of scripted questions. She assured the Senate that she would look at the advice of the selection committee. She also offered an example of a time in which she did select someone other than who the faculty chair had wanted, because he had experience that was more appropriate for the needs of the college.

- A suggestion was made to consider making the dean/area manager optional.

- Previous to 1991, the dean always went to the second level, and the vice president sometimes did.

- The deans would probably want to be included at the second level.

Straw poll results:
- Would like dean/area administrator required at second level: 14
- Would like dean/area administrator optional at second level: 8
- Would not like dean/area administrator at all at second level : 0
- Would like vice president required at second level: 12
- Would like vice president optional at second level: 11
- Would like both dean/area manager and vice president at second level: 11
- Would not like both the dean/area manager and vice president at the second level: 4
- Would like process monitor required at second level: 7
- Would not like process monitor required at second level: 6
One senator pointed out that in at least one division, the dean of the division could have come from any discipline—not necessarily one housed within the division. Some divisions have programs representing a diversity of areas. An example was provided of a previous situation in which the dean did not have any knowledge or experience in the area for which a faculty position was being filled.

Movement through sections 16 and 17 was quick. There was no objection to the recommendation in section 16 that the President/Superintendent work with the chair of the selection committee in developing interview questions for the final interview process. Deleting the option of allowing the President/Superintendent invite another candidate to interview if the selection committee cannot recommend another candidate was also supported. Additionally, there was consensus on the recommendation in section 17 that the chair of the selection committee and/or the division dean/area manager check references.

A suggestion was made to consider a way to allow the Senate a chance to hear any concerns about a particular selection process prior to a candidate being forwarded to the Board. It was not clear if this would be feasible given the confidentiality of the process. Another suggestion was made to delete the word “available” from the last sentence of section 16.

The discussion turned to the issue of mandatory versus optional inclusion of a student representative on the first level committee. President Moore reported that she solicited information from presidents of other academic senates about whether or not their campuses require a student on faculty selection committees. Twenty-seven responded. Four campuses require student participation, three allow optional student participation and the students may vote, one allows optional student participation and the student may not vote, two let students participate in the teaching demonstration, 17 do not allow for any student participation on faculty selection committees.

The remainder of the senate meeting (approximately 15 minutes) was spent on further discussion of this issue. Many students attended the meeting to demonstrate their support for student inclusion on faculty selection committees. Several students offered their opinions and arguments in support of this; several senators also shared their opinions and offered suggestions:

Comments in support of mandatory student participation centered around these themes:
- Students participate on other committees. Not including them would be inconsistent.
- Allowing students to participate would offer them a great opportunity to gain experience with respect to the job interview process.
- Students can provide a different perspective.
- The students would only be able to offer opinions—they would not have a vote.

Comments in support of optional student participation centered around these themes:
- Adding a student would be a significant change from what
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historically has been done, and it will impact some departments more than others.

- Based on comments made by faculty at the previous meeting, it seems likely that many departments would choose to include students.
- Making student participation optional would be a positive step; the policy could later be revised to make student participation required.
- The students could appeal to departments to make their case to be on a committee, but the departments need to be able to select the right student for the task.

Other observations were made about the inclusion of language that makes it clear that the District encourages including a non-voting student member; the relationship students have with faculty, which is different from the relationship they have with managers; the greater impact the change in policy would have on some departments over others; and the message that making student participation optional would send to the committees. And, at least one senator expressed how embarrassed and disheartened he was to hear excuses from faculty on this issue, especially considering the interest in encouraging students to participate and be part of the community.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Faculty Senate Secretary, Traci Ukita.

For further details of the meeting, audio recordings are available in the Faculty Senate office located in the Office of Academic Affairs.

NEXT SENATE MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2009
11:05 A.M.
BOARD ROOM

Faculty Senate Office Hours: 8:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Friday.

Debra Moore
President
Ext. 2219

Angela Hoppe-Nagao
Vice President
Ext. 2851

Miriam Tolson
Program Assistant II
Ext. 2217

Traci Ukita
Secretary
Ext. 2592

Visit the Faculty Senate Web Page www.cerritos.edu/faculty-senate for agendas, minutes and other information of interest to faculty, staff and others.