<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breit</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabish</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fobi</td>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortner</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gersitz</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallinger</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoppe-Nagao</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Liberal Arts (Vice President)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntila</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewellen</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Science</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoVetere</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellas</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Library (President)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obasohan</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soden</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukita</td>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>Counseling (Secretary)</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedell</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER REPRESENTATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacy</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>(Non Voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Student Liaison</td>
<td>(Non Voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolze</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>CCFF Liaison</td>
<td>(Non Voting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: Bill Farmer, M. L. Bettino, Stephanie Murguia, Linda Rose, Bryan Reece, Rich Cameron, Sunday Obazuaye, Phil Hu, Dennis Falcon, Ken Matsuura, Julie Bathke, Brittany Lunndeen, Crystal Caldera
MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting began at 11:10 a.m. The flag salute was led by Secretary Ukita.

MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Chester and seconded by Senator Soto to approve the minutes of 4/6/10.

Action: Minutes were unanimously approved.

REPORTS

President

Ms. Moore acknowledged that there is a lot of concern about the class size issue. She noted that there could be a few different places on the agenda in which it could be brought up, and asked that the Curriculum Committee report be merged with the class size discussion. There was no objection.

Secretary

Ms. Ukita reminded the body that there will be no Senate meeting on the 20th.

CCFF Liaison

Dr. Stolze reported:
- There was productive discussion at the bargaining session with the District last Friday. It has been a good round of bargaining so far.
- There will be a CCFF meeting next Tuesday at 11:00 a.m.
- Dr. Lacy will be available for an open-ended question and answer session on Tuesday, April 27th at 2:00 p.m. in the Boardroom.
- Last week, he and Dr. Lacy discussed the possibility of a Memorandum of Understanding on the class size issue.

Student Senate Liaison

Mr. Silva reported:
- There will be an ASCC President and Student Trustee candidate forum on Thursday in BK 111. The TalonMarks plans to interview candidates. If faculty members would like candidates to speak to their classes, their best bet is to contact Holly (Bogdanovich).
- Elections will take place on Wednesday, April 21st and Thursday, April 22nd, from 9:00-2:00 and 5:00-8:00.
- Volunteers are needed for Senior Preview Day, which will take place on Friday, April 23rd from 7:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m. Please contact Shirley Arceo.
President Moore announced that Senator Fabish has a scheduling conflict that will prohibit him from being able to attend the Coordinating Committee meetings for the rest of the semester. She asked if anyone would be interested in subbing for him. Senator Chester volunteered.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION ITEMS

SLO Improvement Plan
Improvement plans are due April 16th.

Employers Panel
Will take place on Tuesday, April 20th at 11:00 a.m. in LC 155.

Outstanding Faculty Awards
Will take place on Thursday, April 22nd at 11:00 a.m. in the Student Center.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT AND DISCUSSION

Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Rich Cameron, provided a general report of committee activities before moving on to discuss the class size issue. The Curriculum Committee is wrapping up another year with only one more meeting scheduled. Mr. Cameron reported it has been an interesting year in that there has been a change in the committee’s leadership after many years. It has also been a relatively light year with fewer new course proposals or modifications than there have often been in the past, and almost as many courses were inactivated as new courses were approved. The committee also had a problem of not having a quorum for two meetings in a row. Mr. Cameron further reported that in an attempt to eliminate the stacks of paper usually generated in preparation for the meetings, the committee went to an electronic format; however, it was not well-liked, so they are back to using paper. Mr. Cameron, though, believes they need to consider some sort of electronic format. There are many other schools using an electronic content management system (primarily CurricuNet); only about one-third of the campuses are not doing so. Mr. Cameron expressed his hope that the College will consider going to an electronic system when more funding becomes available.

Mr. Cameron reported that the committee approved four classes this year for class size reductions (SPCH 235, POL 101, ANTH 100, and ANTH 115). Speech was approved last semester; the others were approved this semester. The size for the speech class went down to the same number as the other courses approved for meeting the Critical Thinking requirement of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum. The committee approved the requests from Political Science and Anthropology to reduce their sizes from 60 to 48 students, because the department faculty felt that students were not succeeding, and reducing class size would contribute to student success. Mr. Cameron’s report on class size served as the impetus for a lengthy discussion of the issue, which lasted for most of the rest of the meeting.
As part of the discussion, Senator Fernandez presented copies of what he described as Board Policy pertaining to the curriculum process. In response to a series of questions directed to him, Mr. Cameron offered information based on his understanding and experience as Curriculum Committee chair:

- The procedure distributed by Senator Fernandez is used by the committee when a new course is proposed. New courses are taken to the Board, and they have ultimate responsibility; however, to his knowledge, course modifications have not necessarily gone to the Board, though he acknowledged he could be wrong.
- The procedure is for new courses and new programs.
- His understanding of the word “verification” is an acknowledgement that procedures have been followed up to the point in question. It also suggests the approval process of modifications could involve others on campus. He does not consider verification to include veto.
- When a new course is proposed, class size is included and is one of the elements of consideration for approval. The Curriculum Committee has dealt with course modifications, but they have not had a lot of experience with them in the years he has been involved.
- The Political Science and Anthropology departments did submit their requests by established deadlines, the committee approved their requests, and the administration had an opportunity to make a case.
- He does not know if the Board would defer to the Curriculum Committee or to the administration, and he is unaware of course modifications being taken to the Board.
- Whether or not the Vice President of Academic Affairs has the authority to refuse to sign what the committee approved would depend on how much authority the Board has given the vice president, and he does not know how much authority the vice president has been given. Although he is unaware of any modifications going to the Board, Title 5 would give the Board the final say on courses.

Senator Obasohan specifically stated for the record his belief that the vice president does not have authority to veto what the committee has done.

Mr. Cameron also provided information from the training he received from the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. According to language from their training materials, class size is considered to be an academic and professional matter that is commonly negotiated. Mr. Cameron read a segment from the ASCCC training guide, which emphasizes the need for a clear policy for how to proceed when a disagreement occurs, as well as the importance of discipline expertise as the most qualified source to appropriately determine limitations on class size. The working
conditions aspect is intertwined with the pedagogical. Mr. Cameron explained that he felt it was his responsibility to report to the Senate and the Union when he was notified that the College was not going to recognize the action the committee took with the Political Science class. In response to a couple other questions, Mr. Cameron shared his understanding that status quo is followed until the issue is negotiated, and he confirmed that the role of a curriculum committee as defined by Title 5 is that of a recommending body rather than a decision-making body.

Faculty from the H/SS division believe the appropriate process was followed, and that some level of action has to take place unless the Administration can provide a reason as to why the Anthropology and Political Science departments were left out of the status quo process.

Dr. Lacy explained that Union and the Administration agree that class size is a working condition item to be negotiated. The existing faculty contract states that the District retains all of its customary powers and authority to direct, manage and control the operations of the District to the full extent of the law. It also addresses the District’s right to maintain the efficiency of District operations and to determine the curriculum. The District will not give up these rights, but Dr. Lacy assured the body that there will be a clearly defined process, which does not currently exist. Additionally, Dr. Lacy pointed out that the document that Senator Fernandez shared is an Administrative Procedure rather than Board Policy, and that the procedure pertains to adding new courses and educational programs. Dr. Lacy also acknowledged that she made an incorrect statement at the previous Senate meeting about what the reduction in class size would cost the District. She explained that she had used an old formula. She reported that the reduction in class size for POL 101 would result in a loss of 768 student seats; and the funding loss would actually be $358,243 (based on the number of sections offered this academic year, including summer), and not the close to eight hundred thousand she previously reported. Dr. Lacy apologized for giving incorrect information. She also expressed her concern that the class size item is not in the contract, but asserted that it will be in the contract; however, the District will always have administrative oversight with respect to class size. Dr. Lacy shared her belief that the class size item will be revisited, and there will be rational times to consider reductions, but this might not be a rational time—a time to lose money and turn students away. The success rates and retention in the courses in question are above the college-wide average. There may be a better time, and the District will negotiate in good faith.

The discussion continued for another half hour, and many others in attendance offered their observations and comments:

- “Rely primarily” does not mean the faculty always gets what
it wants.

- There seems to be a procedural problem. This discussion might not even have been necessary had an appropriate explanation been received as to why the District was questioning the class size reduction. There needs to be a procedure whereby the administration communicates clearly to the relevant departments. There has been a problem with communication. Other approaches could have been pursued, such as working toward establishing prerequisites, providing the departments with a clear understanding of the District’s concern about class size reduction, or beginning the discussion of how to negotiate this item.

- The Vice President is a voting member of the Curriculum Committee; the Dean of Academic Affairs is not, though is currently serving as the VP's designee.

- There is apparently no written procedure pertaining to class size reductions, though there is past practice.

- The Curriculum Committee approval of the Political Science department’s request was not unanimous. One member voted no and there were two abstentions. For Anthropology, there were two no votes and one abstention. The vote for Speech last semester was unanimous.

- In response to a question directed to him, Mr. Cameron reported he was not aware of any other time when a Curriculum Committee decision was overturned.

- Two other courses went through following the old process, but the Political Science department used the same process, which seems rational. The faculty in that department has consistently taken extra students.

- When asked if the District would consider class size reductions when the budget is better, Dr. Lacy stated it would, and that it would negotiate in good faith. She also indicated that some procedures could be developed with Memorandums of Understanding. If times were better, it would be easier to make some of these decisions. Also, in response to comments made about her use of the term “rational,” Dr. Lacy clarified that what she meant had more to do with the timing—to not cut off more students.

- The Curriculum Committee uses a different set of criteria for class size reduction—it looks at expertise and pedagogy. The District looks at it from a budgetary standpoint and the college as a whole. If this is not the right time to consider class size reductions, perhaps there would be other ways to support the faculty who have to manage the larger classes.

- The point was made that the prior administration did not want faculty to add extra students to classes because of the costs it could incur in terms of providing services. Dr. Lacy explained that the cost she quoted is based on the loss of the FTES, and that an assumption cannot be made that the students who would not be taking political sciences courses
would not already be using services.

- Vice President Farmer provided some reasons for why the screenwriting class from the English department and the argumentation class from the Speech department were approved for class size reductions. He also explained that had the CCFF raised the issue then, he would have felt he could not approve them, because the District has a responsibility to maintain status quo. His understanding of status quo is the class size that previously existed.

- Dr. Stolze agreed that the District has a right to assert its managerial prerogative to not to allow the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to go through, and the contract trumps shared governance when it comes to mandatory subjects to bargaining. Dr. Stolze disagreed with Mr. Farmer about what triggered the Union’s decision to demand to bargain. The Union did not assert its right last fall when the reduction for the speech class was approved because the District did not intervene. When the political science class went through the process, he was led to believe that the administration was planning to not uphold the Curriculum Committee’s approval. The Union should have been directly informed, so they moved forward with a demand to bargain.

- An observation was made that there may be concern about what else the District might bring to a halt. The Curriculum Committee proceeded as they have done in the past. It is not clear to everyone what the District can and cannot do.

- It seems that past practice has been violated if something has been done a certain way over time, and there is not another example of when it was not followed.

- Communication could have been better; procedures need to be cleared up. There may not have been a written procedure, but there was past practice; and there does not seem to be anything that states that the Vice President has the right to stop the practice.

- It was pointed out that the college is in a period of unfunded growth, so it is interesting that one of the arguments is about losing money.

- The Union did formally communicate that class size is a negotiated item. When they learned that the process was going to be stopped, the Union felt it needed to intervene, but the demand to bargain did not specifically reference any actions by Mr. Farmer.

- With respect to status quo, requests for class reductions in the past have not likely been made during such difficult budget times. Faculty made a mistake of asking for a reduction in class size at a bad time. It is disappointing because a lot of attention has now been drawn to this issue, which will impact other departments. Had it been a better time, it might have gone through easily. It should not have gone to the Curriculum Committee during a time like this.
OFFICIAL MINUTES

President Moore urged to body to wrap up the discussion and move onto the election of officers. She suggested that the topic could be placed on the agenda again. Senator Obasohan requested that happen. He also emphatically urged the Union to include in the MOU Dr. Lacy's willingness to consider the issue later.

SENATE DISCUSSION
Election of Officers
Ms. Moore, Ms. Hoppe-Nagao, and Ms. Ukita were elected as President, Vice President, and Secretary respectively by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 12:19 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, APRIL 27, 2010
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                        Angela Hoppe-Nagao
President                          Vice President
Ext. 2219                          Ext. 2851

Miriam Tolson                      Traci Ukita
Program Assistant II               Secretary
Ext. 2217                          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.