MOTIONS AND ACTIONS

8-29-06

None

9-5-06

Minutes of 8-29-06 were approved as written with 3 abstentions and 1 no vote.

9-12-06

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Fobi to approve the minutes of September 5, 2006. Senator Mata (SEM) requested the addition of the following: “a request was made for a listing of the duties of each member of the Executive Board along with the corresponding amount of reassigned time” under item 2, and “Senate-approved department chair procedures and policies may be viewed on the Faculty Senate website under ‘General Information’” under item 6A.

Minutes were unanimously approved with corrections.

9-26-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Senator Trager (Fine Arts) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of September 12, 2006. Minutes were unanimously approved with corrections.

SENATE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

President Reece continued a discussion to determine the body’s interest in pursuing all of the proposed goals and objectives as part of an agenda for student success. He mentioned that he would like to see these as the goals and objectives of the whole campus not just the Faculty Senate.

Of the seven proposed goals, the following were discussed last week: There was general agreement that the Senate should pursue Basic Skills. There was general
agreement that the Senate should pursue Study Skills. There was general agreement
the Senate should pursue State of Education Address.

New discussion occurred around Faculty Hiring Procedures. Senators indicated that last
week the body was split as to whether or not this goal should be part of an agenda for
student success. Continued opinions were expressed as to the appropriateness of this
goal as it is written as part of an agenda for student success. Additional discussion
followed on the Online Education Strategic Plan; Specifications for Classroom, Office
and Laboratories; and Program Completion. There was general agreement that the
Senate should pursue the three latter goals. President Reece reminded the Senate that
this is a living, breathing document that can be added to at any time.

Action (First Action)

Motion made by Senator Fobi (Health Occupations) and seconded by Senator Trager
(Fine Arts) that the Faculty Senate Agenda for Student Success include: Basic Skills;
Study Skills; State of Education Address; Online Education Strategic Plan;
Specifications for Classrooms, Offices and Laboratories; and Program Completion. Furthermore, the Senate 1) recognizes these goals and objectives as primary and
fundamental to the teaching and learning process at Cerritos College; 2) encourages
the campus community to join in our effort to address these goals; and 3) commits to
coordinating or participating in the development of College projects and initiatives
related to these goals. The motion passed unanimously.

Action (Second Action)

Motion made by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Fobi
(Health Occupations) that Faculty Hiring Procedures be handled as a separate goal of
the Faculty Senate and explicitly not included on the Agenda for Student Success. The
motion passed with 15 yes votes and 6 no votes.

Action (Third Action)

Motion made by Senator Lopez (SEM) and seconded by Senator Ernest (Liberal Arts)
that the Faculty Senate adopts Faculty Hiring Procedures as one of its general goals.
The motion passed unanimously.

CCFF UNION COMPACT OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT

President Reece indicated that this compact represents a general statement defining
the roles of the Senate and Union. It is a philosophical statement saying we want to help
each other. It is intentionally written in very broad language. The union executive board
and the Senate executive board are in favor of this.
Action (First Action)

Motion made by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) seconded by Senator Ernest (Liberal Arts) to accept the document as written.

Action (Second Action)

After further discussion from the floor, Senator Ernest motioned for the item to be tabled for further discussion. Senator Sparks seconded the motion. The motion passed by acclamation. The document was subsequently sent (again) to all Senators.

10-3-06

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Page (Student Services) to approve the minutes of September 26, 2006.
Action: Motion was passed with two abstentions.

Minutes Recommendation
President Reece briefly summarized the issue, reiterating the Executive Board’s recommendation to utilize minutes rather than transcripts in conjunction with audio recordings of proceedings.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Breit (Fine Arts/Communication) to accept the Executive Board’s recommendation to utilize minutes as opposed to transcripts.

Discussion: A question was raised regarding the consideration of getting new technology for podcasts. President Reece confirmed the possibility of technology a new recorder and MP3 capability.

Action: Motion passed with voice votes of ayes, save 2 nays, and no abstentions.

CCFF Union Compact of Mutual Understanding and Support

President Reece summarized where we are in the process of voting on the compact. Senators from Business Education had made a request to take it back to their division for discussion. Their next division meeting will be next week. President Reece informed the body that he was involved in the writing of the document and underscored that the spirit of the document is one of working together in a collaborative fashion. President Fabish shared comments emphasizing the balanced and reciprocal nature of the document and his concerns over a perception that it is a move by the Union to influence the Senate. He reiterated that the compact is meant to establish and clarify mutual respect, openness, understanding, and cooperation.
Motion: It was moved by Senator Mellas (Science, Engineering and Math) and seconded by Senator Trager to vote on the compact.

Discussion: There was confusion about last week’s motion to table the discussion. Some Senators understood last week’s motion to mean the discussion would be tabled until after division meetings. It was determined that while many Senators have already conferred with their divisions, others have not.

Second Motion: It was moved by Senator Mellas and seconded by Senator Trager to put the compact back on the agenda for immediate discussion and subsequent vote.

Action: The motion failed with 10 ayes and 13 nays. Voting on the compact will be delayed for further discussion.

10-10-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Having bypassed the approval of the minutes on the agenda earlier, President Reece addressed it as part of his report, and asked for a motion to either approve the minutes of October 3, 2006, or delay approval until the next meeting.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communication) and seconded by Senator Lopez (SEM) to approve the minutes of October 3, 2006.

Action: Motion passed with voice votes of ayes and one abstention

Planning and Budget Committee Membership

President Reece announced that Jack Swanson (Liberal Arts) will no longer be serving on the Planning and Budget Committee as his term is up, and that he has persuaded Senator Namala to replace him.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Ukita (Counseling) to approve Senator Namala (Humanities/Social Sciences) as a replacement for Jack Swanson on the Planning and Budget Committee.

Action: Motion passed with voice votes of ayes.

10-24-06

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Wilson (SEM) to approve the minutes of October 10, 2006.
**Discussion:** Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) requested amendments to the minutes under item 4A (Scholar’s Honors Program Presentation) to change the figure of 350 under item 4A to 250 in the second open bullet, and to make clear the figure of 37% is from the Fall 2005 semester in the seventh open bullet. Senator Juntilla also added that the number of SHP students is now 240.

**Action:** Minutes were approved as amended with one abstention.

**Web Standards Committee**

Meets on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Tuesday of the month at 1:00 in LC 135

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Johnson to nominate Bob Livingston (Business Education) as a faculty representative to the Web Standards Committee.

**Action:** Motion passed by voice vote of ayes, and no nays or abstentions.

**CCFF Union Compact of Mutual Understanding and Support**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks and seconded by Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) to accept the Compact of Mutual Understanding and Support between the CCFF and the Senate.

**Action:** Motion passed with 17 ayes, 3 nays, and 1 abstention

11-7-06

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Moore (Library) and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to approve the minutes of October 31, 2006.

**Action:** Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes, save one abstention.

11-14-06

**Approval of Minutes**

After verifying a quorum in attendance, President Reece called for a motion to approve the minutes of November 7, 2006.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by VP Moore (Library) to approve the minutes of November 7, 2006.

**Action:** Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes, save one abstention.
Program Review Chair Member of the Planning and Budget Committee

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to recommend that the Program Review Chair or designee be a member of the Planning and Budget Committee as one of the faculty representatives.

**Discussion:** A question was raised about programs that do not submit a program review report (e.g., Nursing). Prof. Serwin confirmed that their self-studies will be read to identify their needs as well. There was also discussion about whether or not one of the faculty representatives already on the committee would be replaced, or if we would request a new seat for the Program Review Chair or his/her designee. There are currently seven faculty representatives on the Planning and Budget committee. This includes the Faculty Senate President, who is an automatic member. President Reece suggested that the Program Review Chair or designee would replace the next faculty representative whose term expires, unless one of the current representatives would like to give up his/her seat. CCFF President Fabish requested the Senate also consider ongoing union representation as well. President Reece indicated that he would be open to the discussion, but would prefer to discuss it separately.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

President Reece concluded that this will go into effect when the next opening is available.

**11-28-06**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks and seconded by Senator Moore (Library) to approve the minutes of November 14, 2006.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

**Matriculation – One Set of Instructions for How to Matriculate**

VP Moore described an issue that came up at the last Matriculation meeting. It was noted at that meeting that there are several different places on the college website listing different matriculation instructions. The committee sees a need to have one set of instructions.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to recommend having one set of instructions for how to matriculate.
**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

12-5-06

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of November 28, 2006.
- **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

**BUDGET DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM REVIEW**

- President Reece furnished and reviewed a memo that was presented last week from the Faculty Senate to the Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee (Dr. Vela). He indicated that he would like to get the document to Dr. Vela in time to distribute it to committee members before the next Planning and Budget Committee meeting on Thursday, December 7th. As item 3.0 had been slightly modified since the last meeting, President Reece read that section aloud to the body. Some Senators pointed out items that needed correction or clarification, as well as offered suggestions for changes in wording and format, which were noted by President Reece.
  - **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Johnson and seconded by Senator Soden to approve the document with recommended changes.
  - **Action:** Motion was passed unanimously by acclamation.

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

President Reece announced that Mageya Sharp (Business Education) and Senator Dean Mellas (SEM) have expressed interest in participating on this committee as a replacement for Bernie Negrete and possibly David Fabish. Professor Sharp may have some scheduling problems. Senator Mellas has no scheduling conflicts.

- **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve Senator Mellas for the Coordinating Committee.
  - **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously by acclamation.

1-23-07

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Having observed the presence of a quorum, President Reece entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

- **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of December 5, 2006.
  - **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.
Program Review Linked with Planning and Budget

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) and seconded by Senator Soden to reaffirm the Senate recommendation voted on last semester, and then go forward.

**Discussion:** Much discussion took place. A few Senators and other faculty shared their understanding of and experiences with unit planning and Program Review, which underscored the fact that different departments do different things and there are different understandings of what the processes are. Several Senators expressed a desire to have the processes clarified. There was some confusion as to the meaning and intent of the motion. It was clarified that the motion is to reaffirm the Senate’s desire to have Program Review linked to Planning and Budget. It was also requested that Senate leadership come back with more details about a process.

**Action:** Motion was passed unanimously by acclamation.

1-30-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

President Reece explained that some Senators may not have been able to open the unofficial minutes sent via email (hard copies were furnished). The Senate Office has transitioned to the use of the newest MS Office suite, so there were some glitches.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the minutes of January 23, 2007.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

**Sabbatical Leave Committee**

- Committee Chair Kimberly Rosenfeld was not able to come to the meeting due to a time conflict, so committee member and Senate Vice President Debra Moore (Library) presented a proposal to adjust the timeline for sabbatical leave requests. The current timeline has the process beginning in September and ending with Board approval in February/March. This timeline has consistently proven to be problematic with faculty and deans. The proposed timeline would have the process begin in April, with final Board approval in November/December. This new timeline would give applicants more time to write and revise their applications.
- VP Moore asked the body for input. She also shared that the committee members voted unanimously to go with the new timeline. President Reece also shared that he spoke to VP Farmer, and he is also in favor of this.
- A few Senators provided favorable responses, and a short discussion about how the timeline might affect scheduling for the fall semester took place.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger and seconded by Senator Soden to accept the proposed new timeline for sabbatical leave applications.
Action: Motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Curriculum Committee

- President Reece explained that the committee has asked the Senate to vote on a recommendation to add the Dean of Admissions & Records, Stephanie Murguia, to the committee as a non-voting member. Vice President Moore added that this would be more for communication purposes, and that there were no objections from members of the Curriculum Committee

Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology and seconded by Senator Ukita to approve the Curriculum Committee’s recommendation to include Ms. Murguia.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

2-6-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Moore (Library) to approve the minutes of January 30, 2007.

Action: Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes, save one abstention.

2-13-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of February 6, 2007.

Action: Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes, save one abstention.

2-27-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Wilson (Science, Engineering and Math) and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to approve the minutes of February 13, 2007.

Action: Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes, save two abstentions.

3-6-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of February 27, 2007.

Discussion: Clarification was asked for with respect the notation of “45,000 webpages. At last week’s Senate meeting, President Reece originally used incorrect terminology (websites), and was corrected during the meeting (webpages). Minutes reflect the
correct terminology.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

### 3-13-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the minutes of March 6, 2007.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

**Sabbatical Leave Committee**

The Chair of the Sabbatical Leave Committee, Kimberly Rosenfeld, distributed abstracts of sabbatical leave proposals for 2007-2008. Ten faculty in total have applied for leave. Nine submitted proposals for a full year; one submitted a proposal for one semester. Eight have requested leave at 100% of their regular salary; two have requested leave at 70%. Professor Rosenfeld communicated the committee’s interest in presenting them to the Board on March 21st.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to accept and approve the report of the Sabbatical Leave Committee to forward to the Board of Trustees.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

Professor Rosenfeld also distributed and presented her year-end report. She thanked the Senate for approving the sabbatical application timeline change. The 2008-2009 sabbatical leave intent forms will be sent to faculty on April 1st. She announced that they have yet to receive a report from one of the faculty who went on leave last year. They hope to get that person’s report by April 18th. The committee also plans some changes for next year, which include updating the committee website. They plan to include application and report templates, checklists, and samples. They will also include a frequently asked questions section.

### 3-27-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Lopez (SEM) to approve the minutes of March 13, 2007.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

**5% Reserve Budget**

President Reece distributed a memo from Senate Leadership to the Senators that provides a summary of what transpired at the last Board meeting with respect to the 5% reserve issue. The Board agreed to consider alternate language on proposed Board Policy 6200, which contains the 5% reserve language the Senate has been debating.
The proposed policy states that the unrestricted general fund reserves shall be no less than five percent. The proposed change in the language modifies the statement to read that the unrestricted general fund reserves should [emphasis added] be no less than five percent. By changing the language from shall to should, the Board would not need to vote unanimously to dip into the reserves, but could do so with a simple majority. President Reece shared his opinion that the modified statement would likely be acceptable to the VP of Business Services and the Board of Trustees. After a short discussion in which several Senators as well as CCFF President, David Fabish, shared their opinions on the language and the matter in general, a motion was made. **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) to adopt the proposed language and forward it to the appropriate agencies. **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes

**Education Summit**

President Reece provided a brief summary of an idea presented by Senator Hu (Liberal Arts) at the last Senate meeting to develop a Senate committee to coordinate efforts on civic education. **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Mellas (SEM) to approve the formation of a working group to investigate the possibility of coordinating a fall program. **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes

**Shared Governance Documents**

President Reece summarized efforts to date on this matter, and provided a memo that summarizes comments received about the recommended changes suggested by the Coordinating Committee, as well as recommended action. President Reece read from sections of the memo, and in response to a question asked about one of the comments offered by the Program Review Committee, explained that editorial comments can be made. The question of CCFF membership on committees was raised. President Reece confirmed that Faculty Senate committees are not the same as institutional committees, but could not confirm with absolute certainty that membership would not have to be approved by the Coordinating Committee. If CCFF wanted to make a case for membership on Senate committees, it could appeal to the Senate or directly to the District. President Fabish explained that CCFF is seeking to win Union presence on institutional committees as part of the negotiation process, but they have been told that in that process they cannot ensure CCFF membership on Senate committees. He underscored not wanting to push CCFF membership on Senate committees without Senate’s approval, welcome and endorsement. There are some Senate committees that he believes would benefit from having Union representation. Generally, their position is that where appropriate, they would want to add a faculty member from the Union without taking away a spot from the Senate. In response to a question asked, President Fabish indicated that he would prefer language that specifies the representative would be the CCFF President or designee. President Fabish officially
requested that the Senate consider CCFF presence on Senate committees. To bring the discussion back to the shared governance document, President Reece suggested that the body approve the document with a statement to the Coordinating Committee that the Senate is considering CCFF membership, providing notification that the membership sections may change. Then, details can be addressed in further, more thorough discussion. Before a motion was made, one Senator pointed out that there was no language that ties in Planning and Budget in the Program Review section. It was noted that the Program Review Chair has been approved to sit on the Planning and Budget Committee as one of the Senate2s faculty appointees. President Reece will include language that reflects that the Program Review Chair sits on the Planning and Budget Committee, and will also incorporate language from the proposed budget development policy.

*Motion:* It was moved by Senator Sparks and seconded by Secretary Ukita to approve the document as amended.

*Action:* Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

4-10-07

Professional Relations Committee End of Year Update

The Chair of the Professional Relations Committee, Nina Motruk (Technology), provided the Senators an update:

- The evaluation of nominees for Outstanding Faculty Awards went well. The ceremony will take place next week. There will be a five minute video on the Most Outstanding Faculty award recipient, Dr. John Haas (Humanities/Social Sciences).
- The committee made a few changes to the Procedures for Outstanding Faculty Awards document to update it, and asked the Senate to approve them.

*Motion:* It was moved by Secretary Ukita and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the changes to the document.

*Action:* After a spelling error was pointed out, the motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

President Reece thanked Professor Motruk and her committee for their hard work this year.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*Motion:* It was moved by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Namala (Humanities/Social Sciences) to approve the minutes of March 27, 2007.

*Action:* Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.
FERPA

Senators Wilson (SEM), Sparks (Liberal Arts), and Hallinger (SEM) have been working with Vice President Johnson on several FERPA compliance issues, including the development of a best practices document, which makes recommendations about how faculty should interact with students with respect to sensitive privacy information. The document was distributed at the previous Senate meeting, and again at this meeting. In response to a question about whether or not students can grade other students’ quizzes in class, Senator Wilson shared his belief that faculty should first ask and receive permission from the students in the class if they want to have students grade each other’s quizzes in class. This still needs clarification. In response to other questions, it was made clear that it is okay to pass back papers in class as long as the grades are not visible (such as if the assignment is folded or if the grade is located on another page that is covered), that stacks of assignments cannot be left for students to go through themselves, and that the names of students enrolled in class needs to be kept private from people who may be asking for the information but do not have a need for it. Senator Hallinger also explained that they are still working on the process that would allow faculty access to records. Senator Wilson explained that the definition of college official will need to be approved by the Board.

Motion: It was moved by Secretary Ukita and seconded by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) to approve the best practices document and make available to faculty.

Discussion: It was suggested that a few specific examples be added to the document. It was also pointed out that Wikipedia might not be an appropriate site to include. In response to a question about the process for obtaining access to transcripts, Senator Wilson explained that a role will be created in PeopleSoft that will allow faculty to access unofficial transcripts.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

President Reece will distribute the document, and it will be included on the Faculty Senate website.

4-24-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Mellas (SEM) to approve the minutes of April 10, 2007.

Action: Motion was approved with voice votes of ayes and two abstentions.

Computer and Information Sciences

President Reece provided a brief summary of the discussion of this item at the previous Senate meeting, and reported that since the last Senate meeting, faculty of the SEM Division voted, unanimously with one abstention, to support the CIS Department’s interest in remaining in the SEM Division. Senator Mellas again summarized the events
that lead to the creation of the CIS Department and its transition to SEM. He also noted that the discussion at the previous Senate meeting moved away from the process, and focused more on the consequences. Prior to introducing the resolution, which focuses more on the process, Senator Mellas briefly outlined a few possible consequences of moving it out of SEM and into the Business Education (BE) Division:

- When CIS was formed and moved to SEM, Office Technologies remained in BE. If CIS moves back to BE, there will be much confusion as to which courses will teach what.
- A lot of the funding for both programs comes from the Vocational and Technical Education Act monies. There is no certainty about the continuing level of VTEA funds. These funds contribute significantly to both programs.
- If the move is already in place, then one third of the BE Division’s faculty will have been procedurally excluded from the selection of the new dean. The CIS faculty should at least have the opportunity to be on the selection committee for the new dean.
- After sharing some of the consequences, Senator Mellas introduced a resolution, presented to protect the integrity of the shared governance process. The Resolution by the Cerritos College Faculty Senate Opposing Department Reassignment Without Shared Governance Process was distributed and read by Senator Mellas.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Lopez (SEM) to forward the resolution.

**Discussion:** Lengthy discussion took place in which Senators, other faculty in attendance, and

- Vice President Farmer presented arguments in support of their perspectives on the matter.
- A Senator from BE communicated the division’s preference that CIS stay with SEM, and declared that the move would probably hurt the Office Technologies program.
- It was confirmed that Senate Leadership was not consulted about the move.
- VP Farmer stressed that it was not his intention to show a lack of respect to the Faculty Senate. He shared his belief, based on his interpretation of the shared governance agreement, that he does not think that this is about educational program development, and that he thinks how a college is organized is a function of what administrators do and that part of his role is to try to equalize the workload between deans when possible. He reiterated the reasons he shared at the previous Senate meeting as to why he decided to make the move. He again shared that he met with the CIS department in February, and noted that most of the discussion at that meeting did not address the issues that have come up. He has asked to schedule another meeting with the department and see if there is some common way to resolve the issue. To address the concern about the job announcements that already went out that reflect the CIS move to SEM, he explained that he originally wrote them with the qualifiers as referenced in the
previous Senate meeting, but Human Resources suggested it would not be appropriate, and that something concrete was needed. He disagreed, but lost the argument. He indicated that if it is decided to revert to the original configuration (CIS stays with SEM), a notice can be sent to candidates before interviews. VP Farmer stressed that nothing was done in an attempt to defy or disrespect the Senate. He also declared that he is not persuaded by the argument that where faculty are located as a department determines whether or not they can be effective. In addition, he explained that he understands and recognizes the issue of the VTEA funds, but he has been assured by the manager who oversees VTEA that he will ask again for clarification that the funds follow programs, not departments and are allocated based on TOP codes.

- President Reece again pointed out that all nine CIS department faculty believe that the move will impact the quality of its programs. He underscored that for decisions that impact quality of programs, the Senate has to be the primary voice in the conversation. He expressed his disappointment that the professional opinions of the faculty in the department are being disregarded.
- Two Senators related past experience with reorganization of departments
- The idea of reintroducing an assistant dean was again presented.
- A Senator from BE again asserted that such a move will affect the Office Technologies program.
- In response to a specific question as to whether or not he instructed staff to look into making the conversion prior to the February meeting with the CIS Department, VP Farmer firmly stated he did not.
- A CIS faculty member clarified that Nick Kremer, the manager who oversees VTEA, indicated that it would not be affected the first year. However, there was not a definitive statement about the funding.
- Another CIS faculty member shared specific concerns about the possibility of losing VTEA funding, which would impact labs and software, and that classes would be affected as competing for limited resources.
- It was noted by one Senator that the wording in one part of the resolution may give the impression that a motion had been made with regard to including a notation as to the status of CIS on the job announcements.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes and one abstention.

5-1-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to approve the minutes of April 24, 2007.
- **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.
Grievance Officer

President Reece indicated that a situation has come to the Senate’s attention which may require the use of the Senate grievance process. The issue was discussed.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business) to recommend Senator Bill Sparks (Liberal Arts) as the Grievance Officer.

Discussion: There was discussion about the job description for the grievance officer. The Faculty Grievance Procedure can be found in the Faculty Handbook.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Academic Excellence Awards (Cheryl Shimazu and Mary Balmages)

President Reece read the following recommendation of the Executive Board: The Academic Excellence Awards Subcommittee and the Academic Affairs Committee jointly recommend that the 45 unit requirement for the Academic Excellence Awards be modified to a 30 unit minimum requirement.

Both committees agree that the 45 unit minimum biases against accelerated students in all programs. These students often enter programs without having to take remedial courses and frequently miss the 45 unit minimum as a result.

Both committees also believe that the 45 unit minimum biases against programs that have lower unit requirements (e.g., Medical Assisting). Many students in these programs are excluded from the Academic Excellence Awards because their programs do not offer or require enough units for qualification.

This proposal does not alter the G.P.A. requirements and is proposed to take effect in the 2007-08 academic year.

Recommended Action:
Support the Committees recommendation.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Dean Mellas (SEM) to support the Committees recommendation.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

Budget Development Document

- President Reece presented a draft of the detailed budget development process. The initial draft of the proposed budget development process was developed in close collaboration with the Program Review Committee and the faculty members that serve on the Planning and Budget Committee.
- Reece listed the goals established by the Senate.
- The Program Review Committee was not part of the planning and budget process in the past.
- Faculty were not included in the budget dialog until too late in the process.
- President Vela is a vocal proponent of the new process.
- When Board approved, it will make the Program Review Committee and faculty a more integral part of the planning and budget process.
- It will be up the faculty members on the Planning & Budget committee to be vigilant of the new process in the future.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business) to accept the Budget Development Process document.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously with voice votes of ayes.

Electronic copy of the Budget Development Process will be sent to all Senators.

5-8-07

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Namala (Humanities/Social Science) to approve the minutes of May 1, 2007.

**Discussion:** Senators Fernandez (Humanities/Social Sciences) and Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) asked that the following be added to item 8A in the minutes of May 1, 2007: “Appreciation was expressed for the Administration’s commitment to psychological services as well as hope they would support the faculty if ever presented with the kind of alarms sent by the faculty at Virginia Tech to their leadership. Faculty members have found Vice President Stephen Johnson to be attentive and responsive in addressing concerns over potentially dangerous students.”

**Action:** Minutes were approved unanimously with corrections. One abstention.

**Career and Technical Education Teacher Pathways Grant Project Manager Hiring Committee**

Sue Parsons (SEM) has volunteered for the committee

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Breit (Fine Arts/Communications) to approve Professor Parsons appointment to the committee.

**Action:** Motion was passed unanimously.

**Grievance Officer**

President Reece provided a brief synopsis of the previous meeting’s discussion and action on this matter. The crux of the situation is there is confusion over how to proceed on a particular grievance that a faculty member has against an administrator because the item is not in the contract negotiated by the Union, but is in the faculty handbook. Because the faculty member needs representation and the item is still in the faculty handbook, it was determined at the previous Senate meeting that the Senate’s grievance process needed to be reinvigorated, and a grievance officer was elected. However, there is still confusion over which body should appropriately handle this situation. While it is anticipated that grievances will ultimately be handled by the Union,
this has not yet been negotiated, and it is unclear how to proceed in the meantime. President Reece asked for direction from the body to have Senate leadership meet with the Union on this matter. Lengthy discussion followed in which Senators and other faculty posed numerous questions. In response to these questions, President Reece offered the following information:

- Several grievances have been processed through the Union on contract items.
- The Senate does not offer legal representation. The Senate would oversee a process that is done internally. Outside legal representation can be sought if not satisfied with that process.
- He does not know of a reason the Union cannot be a part of this process.
- Faculty who are aware of outstanding grievances and have not been contacted by the Senate or the Union may contact him.
- The Union can be part of the process, but we still need to figure out how and be precise.
- He believes that the administration is also confused about the process.
- He believes it is possible to put together an agreement that the Union handle this if it is the faculty member’s preference, and that we may be able to point to some specific court cases that would guide us in terms of handling this situation.

In addition to posing questions, faculty expressed concerns about making sure the faculty member with the grievance is afforded due process in a timely manner and that there not be a void. It was suggested that the Senate handle the grievance and other outstanding grievances until a process can be worked out. It was also requested that Senate leadership work with the Union to hammer out a process and report back to the Senate. It was noted that any actions we take could set precedence with respect to a process to follow if a faculty member grieves against something not currently in the contract. It was also made known that the Union is interested in handling this, but has been trying to determine if it can.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Fobi (Health Occupations) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to direct Senate leadership to discuss with the Union a process for handling such grievances.

**Action:** Motion was passed unanimously.

8-28-07

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of May 8, 2007.

**Action:** Minutes were approved unanimously save one abstention.
Committee Membership Needed

President Reece furnished a handout identifying various committees that need faculty members including:

- **College Committee on Information Technology**

  **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Ukita (Counseling) and seconded by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) to approve the appointments of Debra Moore (Library) and Dean Mellas (SEM) to the College Committee on Information Technology.

  **Action:** Motion unanimously approved.

- **College Coordinating Committee needs one (1) faculty to replace now retired faculty member Criss Lopez de Gaines. Committee currently meets on Mondays from 1:00 – 4:00 p.m., but will go back to meeting from 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. soon.**

- **College Committee on Enrollment Management needs three (3) faculty. Committee meets on the third Thursday of the month from 9:30 – 11:00 a.m.**

- **College Committee on Developmental Education—formerly Basic Skills—needs seven (7) faculty.**

  **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Moore and seconded by Senator Ukita to appoint Lorraine Gersitz (Library) to the College Committee on Developmental Education.

  **Action:** Motion unanimously approved.

- **College Committee on Information Technology needs two (2) faculty. Meeting information will be forthcoming.**

- **College Committee on Student Life needs two (2) faculty. Meeting information will be forthcoming.**

- **College Committee on Web Standards needs four (4) faculty. Committee meets at 1:00 p.m. two times per semester: second Tuesdays of September, October, February and April.**

  **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to appoint Barbara Soden (Business Education) to the College Committee on Web Standards.

  **Action:** Motion unanimously approved.

- **Outstanding Classified Awards Subcommittee of the Staff Development Committee needs one (1) faculty.**

- **A faculty member is needed to serve on an Academic Accommodation meeting for Disabled Students Programs and Services on Wednesday, September 5, 2007.**

  **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks and seconded by Senator Moore to approve Senator Marks to serve at the Academic Accommodation meeting should her schedule allow.
**Action:** Motion unanimously approved.

**Classified Classification and Compensation Study**

President Reece read verbatim a memo that was provided to the Senators. The memo addresses the recent “Comp and Class Study” recommendation that the Senate Clerk position be reclassified. The Senate Executive Committee does not believe the reclassification accurately reflects the duties and responsibilities of the position.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (Science, Engineering and Math) to support the recommendation outlined in the memo, which is as follows: That the Senate President, Tom Chavez and Dodie O'Donnell formally contest the Comp and Class recommendation for the Senate's staff person, and that the Senate President actively participate in the study’s appellate process with the goal of establishing an official job classification/title that meets the administrative needs of the Faculty Senate.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

9-4-07

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the minutes of August 28, 2007.

**Action:** Minutes were approved unanimously save one abstention.

**Agenda for Student Success**

President Reece furnished copies of the Agenda for Student Success, which tracks projects from last year, and includes two recommended new projects. Explaining that he sensed ambivalence about the recommended new project currently titled “Student Success Definition” President Reece noted that it is not something that the Senate has to pursue, and asked for feedback. Several Senators asked questions to gain a better understanding of this project. President Reece articulated an interest in developing a general statement about student success that might identify what success looks like and could speak to our expectations as a faculty of our students, what students could expect from us, what we hope students will be able to experience or gain, how we are unique as a college, how we can distinguish ourselves, how we can define our identity from an academic perspective, etc. Some Senators made general comments of support and many offered suggestions such as using a statement as a mission for the faculty that can guide us in activities on campus, considering the student perspective, using this to dialog with administration, using a student success definition to inform department
efforts and program review, looking at efforts of other institutions, articulating to the students what they should be doing to be successful, acknowledging the preparedness level of our current students and who we are actually serving, and asking our students what the college means to them. After discussion of this recommended new project, President Reece called for a motion.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger and seconded by Senator Marks (Health Occupations) to support the Agenda for Student Success as presented.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

**Local Standards (History Department)**

Senator Fernandez distributed handouts and summarized a situation the History department encountered. The department was interested in screening for a part-time faculty position. The faculty of the department identified qualifications reflecting local standards in the job announcement, and placed the criteria in the section outlining “required” qualifications. After it was reviewed by Human Resources, they noticed that the criteria reflecting the local standards had been moved to the section outlining “preferred” qualifications. They asked HR to pull the flyer and provide an explanation. After repeated requests for more information, they have yet to receive a response. The department faculty expressed an interest in having the Senate discuss this matter. Several Senators shared experiences they have had with related situations, and offered suggestions as well as support for the department.

President Reece confirmed that local standards (which are higher than minimum qualifications established by the Board of Governors) may be used in lieu of minimum qualifications, and suggested a letter from the Senate be penned reminding HR of what is allowed in Ed Code and our Board policy, and that if they would like to request that the department lower local standards to statewide minimums, they need to submit that request to the department.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger and seconded by Senator Ukita (Counseling) to recommend that the Senate President write a letter to Human Resources to remind them of the process.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

President Reece furnished an updated handout on appointments and nominations. A series of motions were approved to appoint faculty to various Shared Governance committees.
Motion: It was moved by Senator Mellas (SEM) and seconded by Senator Ukita (Counseling) to approve Senator Hu (Liberal Arts) to sit on the Coordinating Committee beginning January 2008.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Mellas to approve Senator Sparks to sit on the Committee on Student Life.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson and seconded by Senator Soden to approve Professors Mageya Sharp (Business Education) and Rich Cameron (Fine Arts/Communications) to sit on the Committee on Web Standards.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson and seconded by Senator Soden to approve Vyikki Morgan (Business Education) and David Young (Counseling) to sit on the Committee on Web Standards and the Outstanding Classified Awards Subcommittee of the Staff Development Committee respectively.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously.

Appointments and Nominations

Three faculty are still needed for the Committee on Enrollment Management. Two faculty from Counseling and one from ESL are still needed for the Committee on Developmental Education. Three faculty are needed to sit on the screening committee for the Dean of Academic Affairs position.

The announcement for the SEM Division Dean position will be going out again. Because the screening committee needs to get going right away and the division is not going to be able to meet until Thursday, President Reece called for a motion to allow Senate Exec to approve the faculty the division selects during their division meeting to sit on the screening committee.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to allow Senate Exec to approve the faculty the division selects.

Action: Motion was approved unanimously.
9-25-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Horvath (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of Sept. 11, 2007.
Action: Minutes were approved with one abstention.

Appointments and Nominations

President Reece furnished an updated handout on appointments and nominations. He expressed his appreciation for the many faculty who have volunteered. In some cases, there were more people who volunteered than there was need. President Reece apologized to those who ended up not getting on a committee, and emphasized that there was no intention to exclude anyone. He also reminded everyone that as the committees are shared governance committees, anyone who is interested may attend and contribute to discussion.

One faculty member is still needed for the Committee on College Life, which meets on the first Thursday of the month at 1:00 in BK 111/112.

A faculty member is still being sought to sit in at the Coordinating Committee meetings for Senator Hu until the spring semester. Senator Mellas, who also sits on the committee emphasized the importance of having another faculty voice on that committee.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Ukita (Counseling) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve all of the proposed committee appointments.
Action: Motion was approved unanimously.

It was noted that the meeting times for the different committees are not currently on the Faculty Senate website, but the Senate office is working on it.

10-2-07

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of Sept. 25, 2007.
Action: Minutes were approved unanimously.

10-9-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of October 2, 2007.

**Action:** Minutes were approved unanimously save one abstention.

**Appointments and Nominations**

**Web Standards Committee**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) to approve James MacDevitt (Fine Arts/Communications) for the College Committee on Web Standards.

**Action:** Approved unanimously.

**Local Hiring Standards (History Department)**

President Reece explained that there are two standards for hiring faculty: 1) minimum qualifications established at the state level, and 2) local standards established by campus departments. The History Department has had local standards higher than minimum qualifications, and would like to make an adjustment to them. The recommended change, which was reviewed and approved by the Senate Committee on Faculty Equivalency Standards (formerly Hiring Standards Committee), was presented to the Senate for approval.

- Original standard: “Master’s in History from an accredited university or college. 24 semester units in United States History courses. No more than 6 semester units from lower division.”
- Recommended change: “Master’s in History from an accredited university or college. 21 semester units in United States History courses. No more than 6 semester units from lower division.”

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Marks (Health Occupations) to approve History Department’s request to modify its local hiring standard.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

**10-23-08**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of October 9, 2007.

**Action:** Minutes were unanimously approved.
Update on Senate Programs and Initiatives

President Reece provided copies of the update on the Agenda for Student Success. He re-wrote the overview with the presumption that the fourth initiative on Program Excellence would be approved. He asked the Senators to review the overview later, and then drew their attention to the proposed Program Excellence Initiative. He read the following directly from the handout:

The Program Excellence Initiative acknowledges instructional programs as vital to student success and invites program constituents to systematically improve their programs in a collaborative manner. Central to this initiative are 1) the identification of indicators that substantiate program excellence and 2) the establishment of clear and relevant pathways for achieving program excellence.

President Reece articulated his view that this would not be another committee, but another focus of a platform for discussion. Several Senators offered questions, comments, and suggestions:

- How can this be distinguished from other efforts?
- The word “program” is being used differently by different people. How are we defining it?
- In reference to the Student Learning Initiative, we should include something to explain why the outlined behaviors are necessary/why they are important.

Student Services should be included, as it plays a key role.

As the discussion unfolded, a question regarding the concerns raised by the PE Department was posed. President Reece explained that VP Higdon is scheduled to come to the next Senate meeting, and the HPER/Athletics faculty have been invited to attend. Senate leadership discussed this after the last Senate meeting, and identified the following suggestions: President Reece can step down from the CTC and offer his seat to a HPER/Athletics faculty; recommend to the CTC that they meet on a regular basis, that they develop a website and include their minutes on it, and offer at least two updates to the campus community each semester.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to adopt the Program Excellence Initiative.

**Discussion:** Strike the word “instructional” so it is inclusive of all types of programs.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

President Reece identified other updated sections on the Agenda for Student Success:

- 3.1 - The CTC has agreed to address the issue of bringing instructional spaces up to new standards. Also, President Reece sent an email to department chairs and division deans, asking them to document classroom deficiencies in their unit planning.
3.4 - Would like to develop an operational definition of student success and identify data/processes for tracking progress in this area. In response to a question about having better statistics available, President Reece noted that the college is going to purchase a data warehouse, though he is not sure when. An interest in knowing the cost was expressed.

3.5 - The State of Education Address is beginning to take shape. It is scheduled for November 29th.

3.6 - Though an effort to update and digitize the Faculty Handbook has already begun, it has been formally added to the agenda.

3.7 - President Reece suggested that the Faculty Senate develop a budget proposal for the college that recommends a funding strategy to support the Agenda for Student Success. Such a proposal could be developed in a similar manner to that of the Congressional Budget Office, which takes the budget from the White House and comes up with an alternative presentation of how the budget could be organized. He suggested that some of our interested faculty economists and accountants could work on generating another view of the budget, to open up dialog about what the budget could look like.

o The suggestion was well-received by the body, demonstrated by numerous positive comments and nodding in agreement.

o In response to a question posed by a Senator, President Reece explained that he anticipates that rather than preparing a completely different budget proposal from scratch, the alternative proposal would be generated after seeing what the budget office prepares, and then making possible modifications from there.

o In response to a question about offering the faculty who would work on this effort release time or a stipend, President Reece explained that he sees this as a committee effort, but that once they get together, they can discuss this.

o The CCFF President Stolze noted that they have access to a budget analyst and would be willing to share information. Also, they plan to have a budget forum in November. President Stolze requested that faculty let him know if they have certain questions they want addressed.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) and seconded by Senator Breit (Fine Arts/Communications) to adopt the proposed objective of developing a funding plan for the Agenda for Student Success.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

3.8 - The college will soon start working on revising the strategic plan. The current plan primarily focuses on organizational issues. President Reece would like to see a stronger student success focus.

o There was some discussion about the educational master plan—specifically, not knowing what is going on with it.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to adopt the proposed objective of rewriting the strategic plan with a greater emphasis on student success.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.
President Reece proposed adding an objective under the new Program Excellence Initiative to organize and elevate the college’s transfer program. Our Transfer Center is not funded. We have some very successful transfer-related programs on campus that are not getting the attention they probably should, such as Puente and Project HOPE. We need to get more organized with a clear strategy about how to support our transfer students. Several Senators offered comments and questions:

- In response to a question about who would drive this effort, President Reece shared his inclination toward the Transfer Center as the main force.
- Concern was expressed that not all of our students have a focus of transfer, and that we may be excluding vocational students and programs.
- While our Transfer Center coordinators are doing a good job, in comparison to other campuses, we lack facilities and resources. It is clear that transfer is not a priority.
- We have excellent vocational programs that are already doing well, but we are not doing as well when it comes to transfer, so there is a lot of room for improvement.
- Could we mentor those in charge of the program to see if there are other approaches to improving that department? Where do we need to go to get them the budget?
- It needs to be more of a collective effort for supporting a transfer culture, as opposed to a specific program tied to the Transfer Center—a collective effort that encourages the transfer theme.
- This would address the issue of Cerritos College not being perceived as a transfer college.
- It was suggested that two additional points be added to the Program Excellence Initiative: Support and Enhance Vocational Programs; Monitor the Campus Transformation Process.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senators Soden (Business Education and Wilson (SEM) to adopt the proposed objective to organize and elevate our transfer program.

Discussion: Several faculty members expressed their opinions in support of the objective, noting such things as: transfer is not the job of just the Transfer Center; we lack a transfer mission; our transfer function is segmented; we should support transfer functions; there has been a lack of leadership from administration; and that there has not been an emphasis on transfer for many years. A couple of Senators articulated concerns about the objective, including that having a lot of objectives under each initiative diffuses the importance of everything. Also, a faculty member shared her knowledge of statewide efforts related to transfer—there is talk about a budget proposal for a transfer-based initiative, much like there was for basic skills.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved save two abstentions.
11-6-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*Motion:* It was moved by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to approve the minutes of October 23, 2007, and October 30, 2007.

*Action:* Minutes were unanimously approved.

11-13-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*Motion:* It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the minutes of November 6, 2007.

*Action:* Motion was approved unanimously.

Standing Committee Reports

Chair of the Sabbatical Leave Committee, Professor Kimberly Rosenfeld, provided an update of committee activities:

- The deadline for leave applications was met. Two orientations were held: one for applicants; one for report writers. There were ten applicants who have applied for one-year sabbaticals at either 100% or 70%. There are nine slots. One of the ten applicants has been identified as an alternate. The committee considered seniority and whether or not someone has been on sabbatical before.
- Each report writer has been contacted. Their reports are due December 10th. The committee will continue to mentor them and work through the reports.
- They have started discussions about getting the word out about the many wonderful things faculty are doing on sabbatical.

Professor Rosenfeld distributed abstracts of sabbatical leave proposals for the 2008-2009 academic year. Two main themes across this year’s applicants: going back for formal study (e.g., additional degrees or certificates); technology.

*Motion:* It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) and seconded by Senator Mellas (SEM) to approve the sabbatical leave proposals.

*Action:* Motion was unanimously approved.

In response to a question about publishing prior reports, Professor Rosenfeld acknowledged that an archive could be created. Actual reports may be accessed online.
They are password protected. Directions for how to access the reports may be found on the “forms” page.

President Reece thanked Professor Rosenfeld for her hard work.

President Reece furnished hard copies of a memo he distributed to the Senators via email last week. The memo outlines concerns over Standard IV of the accreditation self-study report, specifically noting that the revision process the self-study underwent over the summer resulted in a version of the Standard IV section that is significantly different than the original document written by the Standard IV committee members. President Reece read the memo to the Board of Trustees last Wednesday. Noting that some of the Senators may not yet have had the chance to read the memo, President Reece proceeded to read the memo to the body.

**Accreditation Report (Standard IV Update)**

After reading the memo, President Reece reported that while the Board did not take formal action, it did ask the administration to work with the Standard IV committee members and try to bring together the original version and the revised version of the Standard IV section. Since then, the co-chair of the committee has indicated that she is not willing to participate in the resubmission of a response to Standard IV, and believes the original version is accurate and should stand. The self-study report is supposed to be mailed out in January.

Vice President Farmer pointed out inaccuracies in the memo. The memo identifies a concern regarding the omission of Noel-Levitz findings related to the standard in question. It is stated in the memo that one of the reasons given for the exclusion of the Noel-Levitz data was because it was not available until late in the fall semester. Vice President Farmer explained that the Noel-Levitz report was sent via email from him to the co-chairs of the accreditation standards on 6/18/07 with the request that they please review the report if they have time and let him know what additions, changes, deletions, if any, they think should be made to their part of the self-study. The email also indicated that he, accreditation co-chairs Linda Rose and Bob Livingston, and self-study editor Lynn Serwin would be reviewing the report and determining how its results should be integrated into the self-study. He stated that the Noel-Levitz report was also posted on TalonNet through most of the summer, and that some of the findings were incorporated into Standard II. Vice President Farmer expressed his belief that the allegation that they were hiding the Noel-Levitz report is not borne out by the facts. He also explained that the accreditation steering committee concluded that the Noel-Levitz report did not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that we are not in compliance with one of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) standards.
Vice President Farmer stated that he thinks some of the statements (in the memo) are unfair or not borne out by the facts. In addition, he asserted that there are factual inaccuracies in the original Standard IV report, as some of what was in the original report are no longer applicable because of changes that occurred during late spring or over the summer, such as the revision of the Shared Governance document. Policies and procedures have also been reviewed by the Coordinating Committee, and in many cases adopted by the Board. There are a lot of statements in the original version of Standard IV that are no longer operable.

Vice President Farmer distributed a handout outlining differences between the original version of Standard IV and the revised version. The handout identifies standards for which the committee recommended a planning agenda and the revised version did not. Vice President Farmer explained that in most cases where this occurred, the steering committee and editor found evidence that the college was now in compliance with the standards because of recent actions, or because the recommended planning agenda included something that is not required for meeting the standard. He pointed out some specific examples and provided explanations. He also expressed his belief that there are a lot of things that can be done to improve the institution, but they may not have anything to do with the ACCJC standards.

Vice President Farmer provided insight into how the editing process took place. A template was developed that was composed of the questions the visiting team will ask. The Standard IV committee did not use the template questions for its report. A four and a half hour meeting took place on May 11th to discuss Standard IV. There were a lot of suggestions for changes and improvements.

President Reece remarked that if the co-chairs received the Noel-Levitz report, then he stands corrected. In response to the statement about the committee not using the template for Standard IV, he explained that the committee was aware of the template, but that they went straight into report writing. It was noted that the other committees that used the template ended up having to write reports for their sections.

President Reece agreed that the changes to the planning agendas are subtle. However, there are about 20 substandards, and under each are three sections: descriptive summary, self-evaluation, and planning agenda. In the original document, much was written in the self-evaluation sections, but in the revised documents the comments were eliminated and replaced with the phrase: “the college meets the standard.” The revised document implies there is no need to improve according to the standards.

The co-chair who is resigning from the Standard IV committee, has asserted that the document that came out of the summer editing process does not accurately reflect the
document written in the original process—that their findings are not reflected in the document that came out in October.

President Reece asked whether the changes made over the summer were referred back to the committee, and if the committee was given copies of the proposed changes.

Vice President Farmer explained that after the May 11th meeting, the Standard IV co-chair told him and Dr. Rose that they were done with it (the report), and that they should do what they want with it. He acknowledged that in retrospect, he should have talked to the chair about it again. He expressed his desire to find a way to resolve this situation, and that the steering committee is ready and willing, and need to figure out how to move forward.

The faculty members on the committee for Standard IV described their involvement. The accreditation faculty co-chair explained that there was no Standard IV faculty co-chair for a while, so he volunteered because he believed it was important that the faculty were represented. He was a late addition to the committee, and was only able to attend one or two meetings before the report was written, and one after it was written. The other faculty member on the committee stated that he attended all of the committee meetings, and explained that while he was asked to be the faculty co-chair, he declined because he did not have any prior experience with the accreditation process. He also indicated that he did not see anything over the summer, that no follow-up meeting for the committee members was scheduled over the summer, and that the current version of the report came as a surprise. He shared his belief that there is a sense of divergence about the leadership of the college, and that both views should be heard, and that the accreditation team should be able to see both.

Numerous other comments were offered and questions were raised by Senators, some receiving responses from VP Farmer or President Reece:

- Why is it that four or five members of the original committee feel very strongly about the modified version, and that the original should stand? Has he (VP Farmer) spoken to them? We need to find out what happened. There must be a compromise that can be crafted. If four or five members of the committee feel strongly, then the report is not ready to go.
  Who is the controlling authority for what wording goes in the report? Is there relevance to the fact that certain policies have been changed over the summer? Would it be appropriate for the opposing commentary to be included? VP Farmer explained that it needs to be a college wide document. The committees met every Friday in the spring. The committee would review what had been written, and would make suggestions. The co-chairs would typically go back and make revisions. May 11th was the last meeting, and that was when the co-chair indicated the committee was done with the report. President Reece shared his
understanding that the co-chair felt it was a difficult environment in which to speak freely, and that they delayed sending the document forward out of courtesy to Dr. Vela, who was in the middle of a hiring process last spring. He pointed out that there is an underlying sense that the document could put a person in jeopardy because it is critical. He has received many confidential communications from people who are feeling uncomfortable about the criticism in the original document, especially considering that the criticism was eliminated during the revision process.

- It sounds like faculty had their opinion, gave their opinion, administration did not like it, so it was changed. VP Farmer asserted that they looked for evidence to support conclusions. He urged everyone to read both documents and look to see if all of the statements were supported by evidence. President Reece pointed out that not everything in the revised document is supported by evidence. There are many positive things in the revised document that are not supported by evidence.
- The faculty are afraid (to speak out).
- Is there some way for the committee to meet with whoever makes the changes? Perhaps with a mediator? Having two different versions is not desirable, because it will call attention to our mess. If a version can be developed that meets everyone’s needs and speaks the truth that would be desirable. President Reece noted that that is what the Board wants. The administrative co-chair has stated she will not be involved in that process.

President Reece declared that the issue could not be resolved during the meeting. He suggested a motion to send an email to all accreditation co-chairs, committee members, and organizers with copies to administration and the Board. The email identifies concerns over the accuracy of Standard IV. It requests of the committee members that they carefully review their standard’s most current report and compare it to their original work. They are asked to contact the Senate office if they feel the message of the document has been significantly changed, content was eliminated, or they were told it was too late to add new information.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to approve the distribution of the email.

**Discussion:** In response to a question about if there is a concern for the other standards, President Reece shared his opinion that there is not as big of a problem in the other standards, but since there was a problem with one standard, we need to see if the committees’ comments were incorporated into the whole document to establish the validity of the process. One Senator pointed out that regardless of the report that comes out, the accreditation committee is going to talk to a lot of people. Even if a problem is not in writing, we need to get the voice that will be heard when the team comes through.
Vice President Farmer explained that the visiting team can talk to anyone, that people can request an appointment to meet with them, and that there will be two open forums.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.

11-27-07

**Standards for Online Instruction**

The Chair of the Senate Committee on Technology Based Learning, Professor Angela Hoppe-Nagao, reported that the committee had a special meeting with Senators Wilson and Mellas (both SEM). They reached important agreements, and Senators Wilson and Mellas made significant contributions to the document. President Reece explained that Senator Ernest identified numerous grammatical and formatting errors to be changed, and that Vice President Moore will include them when she moves the document into the Faculty Handbook.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Ernest (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senators Soden (Business Education) and Mellas (SEM) to approve the document.

**Discussion:** It was requested that the sections on intellectual property, class size, and academic integrity be revisited at a future date. Professor Hoppe-Nagao indicated the committee would be happy to look at those areas.

**Action:** Motion was approved unanimously and to great applause!

Tacked onto this discussion item, one Senator expressed disappointment in the fact that faculty still cannot access PeopleSoft and do things they need to do such as access transcripts, and asked to place this issue on a future agenda and see what is holding up getting the policies approved.

12-4-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of 11/13/07 and 11/27/07.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved.

1-22-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Wedell (Health Occupations) to approve the minutes of 12/4/07.
Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

Appointments and Nominations

Campus Transformation Committee

President Reece announced that the CTC has been expanded. A list of nominated representatives was provided.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the list of faculty representatives to the CTC.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

1-29-08

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Sparks (Liberal Arts) and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to approve the minutes of 1/22/08.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

Update on Agenda for Student Success

President Reece furnished copies of a proposed 2009-2012 Strategic Plan development process that could be brought to the Planning and Budget Committee by faculty representatives. The proposed plan offers a recommended process that includes the establishment of a Strategic Planning Taskforce. The plan also offers recommendations with respect to the purpose of the taskforce, chairperson selection and responsibilities, membership, governance, support, meeting schedule, ongoing evaluation of the plan, and a timeline of key deliverables and activities. President Reece also distributed a memo to the Senators from Senate Leadership that provides information on the history of the strategic planning process, as well as a recommendation from Senate Leadership to the Senators to adopt the proposed plan, forward it to the faculty representatives of the Planning and Budget Committee, and request the faculty representatives to present the proposed plan to the Committee.

Senators presented questions, and offered comments and suggestions:

- In response to a question about whether shared governance committees are supposed to have comparable numbers of constituents in each, President Reece explained that there is no specific formula, and that different shared governance committees have different numbers.
- It was suggested that two more faculty members be added.
- It was suggested that another student be added.
- In a response to a request for clarification about the purpose of the strategic plan, President Reece explained that the main goal of a strategic plan is to identify where we want the college to go. It creates a vision of where we want to go, and identifies major goals and objectives for how we are going to get there.
- In response to questions about whether members from the previous committee will be incorporated into the new committee for historical perspective, President Reece explained that the committee was not previously a shared governance committee, although it was representative of constituent groups. It is now an official shared governance committee. Some of the members will probably be the same.
- In response to a question about whether the taskforce will be looking into the amount of funds available to accomplish the goals and objectives, President Reece suggested that strategic planning is a little like “realistic dreaming.” It identifies where we would like to go with an understanding that sometimes we can afford it; sometimes we cannot. When a concern was expressed about the possible scenario of good ideas being offered but immediately shot down with an explanation of “there isn’t any money,” President Reece concurred that the committee would draft ideas, think of potential things that can be accomplished, and looks to see if we have the funds or can find a way to meet the goal or identify something as a longer-term objective.
- President Reece reported that Senator Namala (Humanities/Social Science) and Professor Mark Fronke (Business Education) are still working on examining and generating a different perspective on the budget.
- The belief that a budget should not restrict ideas was expressed by a few Senators.
- The point was made that there are ways to obtain funding. Ideas such as pursuing grants and renting out space were offered.
- It was observed that increasing the numbers could make the committee unwieldy, and that anyone would be able to attend the meetings. In response to a question about whether there is some kind of ratio, President Reece explained that there is none, and pointed out that numbers can be forwarded as part of the proposal, and that they could change.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Breit (Fine Arts/Communications) to forward the proposed plan with the changes discussed to increase the numbers of Senate representatives (4) and students (2), and to add the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved.

**Academic Leadership Outcomes (ALO) Envelope Opening**

Due to the substantial data input needs of the ALO survey, President Reece shared Senate leadership’s interest in modifying the envelope opening process, opening the envelopes in three stages rather than all at once to alleviate the data input demands. He
proposed that envelopes would be opened after the Senate meetings on 1/29/08 and 2/5/08, and on the original date of 2/8/08, only for data input purposes. He asked the following to be read into the record:

We will be opening survey envelopes in three public meetings to spread out the data input demands this survey presents. Data will be input and stored on a password protected computer in the Faculty Senate President's office. The Faculty Senate President; the data processing assistant and the Faculty Senate Clerk will be the only individuals with access to the data through February 8, 2008. To maximize the integrity of the survey process, no results or trends will be made public until after February 8, 2008.

After reading the statement, it was brought to President Reece’s attention that it is really February 12th that the result would be made public. He concurred.

President Reece reported that over 170 surveys were sent out originally. Others have requested surveys to fill out, so 196 have been sent out altogether.

A few questions were raised and potential problems pointed out. President Reece explained that information on the surveys would not be shown at the openings. The numbers on the outside envelopes will be checked off the list, so that it is clear which surveys have been returned. (Numbers were randomly assigned to surveys. Numbers were not attached to anyone’s name; there is no record of who received which survey.)

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Science) to approve the recommendation to open the envelopes in three stages.

**Action:** Motion unanimously approved.

2-5-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Hallinger to approve the minutes of 1/29/08. **Action:** Motion was unanimously approved.

2-12-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Motion: It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Page (Student Services) to approve the minutes of 2/5/08. Action: Motion was unanimously approved

Academic Leadership Outcome (ALO) Survey

President Reece furnished a document summarizing the results of the ALO survey. The document includes an overview of the ALO, including the numbers of surveys distributed and returned, tables with percentages of responses and mean scores for each item on the survey, a chart identifying areas of greatest concern, a table that summarizes composite mean scores, histograms reflecting distributions and mean scores, comments submitted by respondents, appendix of frequently asked questions about the instrument, and an explanation of how to read the tables. With the document projected on a screen, President Reece walked through the first ten pages of the document, explaining how to read the data, and fielding questions asking for clarification of what the numbers mean along the way. President Reece explained that approximately 300 comments were submitted. He tried to keep language as exact as possible, but redacted comments that included personal information, so no names of individuals or divisions appear. Grammatical errors were not corrected. A few comments were not legible. He suggested to the senators that they read the comments on their own time, but he did call their attention to the last set of comments on the survey itself, noting that there were positive comments. He also pointed out that the last section includes responses to questions that surfaced as the process and instrument were being developed, and that there is a page that outlines how to read the tables. President Reece invited the body to share comments and observations. A few trends were pointed out: faculty and staff generally gave similar scores; scores by administrators were generally lower; scores by students were generally higher. Comments affirming the process, the instrument, and President Reece’s time and hard work in developing the instrument and gathering the results were offered by numerous faculty members at the meeting. Descriptors such as —amazing,‖ —outstanding,‖ and —excellent‖ were attributed to the instrument and the process. President Reece shared with the body how impressed he was with how everyone contributed. Many people helped in developing the instrument, determining how to administer it, and thinking through how to lay out the results. He remarked that he was pleased with the professional tone.

In response to a request to describe the process leading to the gathering of data, President Reece explained that the process started with the Fine Arts/Communications division asking the Senate to consider a vote of no confidence. Other divisions followed on the heels of that request. As the Senate began to consider the issue in November, two other divisions asked the Senate to slow down and collect some more information. Senate leadership started thinking about how to collect information, and began looking at the idea of an assessment, and began building an instrument in early December. Drafts of the instrument were sent to Senators for feedback. Feedback was also solicited from statisticians, colleagues in the psychology department who do a lot of survey development, and the State Academic Senate office. The desire was to create a real survey that could provide feedback on areas in which the president is doing well or
not well. It took about six weeks to firm up the instrument. A faculty member who is a local elected official and a CCFF member was consulted. Also, processes from the State Academic Senate and LA County Registrar’s office were looked at. Basically, the process ended up being the voting process the CCFF used before. The surveys were opened in public in three stages so that data could be input along the way. At the openings, the senate clerk crossed off each survey from the official list to verify that the survey was one that had been officially distributed (numbers on the outside envelopes had been randomly assigned so that it could not be determined which individuals were assigned which numbers); officers of the executive board opened the inside envelopes and wrote numbers on the surveys in the order they were opened and initialed the surveys. Comments were offered commending the Senate for doing a good job, and acknowledging the hours Senate leadership put into the effort. Noting that there would be a reaction by the Senate to the survey results, one senator encouraged his colleagues to go back to their constituencies and make sure they understand it. Requests that digital copies of the results be made available to facilitate easier communication and deliberation with colleagues were met with affirmation by President Reece. Digital copies will be made available.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the ALO report, which is believed to represent an accurate and fair expression of the Cerritos College community.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved. President Reece informed the body that the Senate executive board had a meeting scheduled with President Vela in the morning to go over the ALO results, but she had to go out of town to be with an ill family member. Her office communicated to the Senate office that information could be sent to her by email, as she would be checking email. President Reece informed the body that he will send the results by email. He also explained that the president’s office was contacted several times during the development of the survey, inviting the president to comment on helping structure the survey. The president decided not to participate in that process, as is her right. President Reece noted that he let the president know that he would be happy to meet, and that he would also understand if she did not want to meet.

Voting on Confidence

President Reece furnished a memo with a proposed timeline of remaining ALO items and a draft of a ballot for the vote on confidence. President Reece noted that the body still needed to discuss the process if the President decides to come to the next Senate meeting and present significantly new information. He then turned to the body for comments. One senator, acknowledging that he had not read the comments in detail, remarked that he was not surprised by the results, but he had hoped to see more specifics. He suggested that time be taken to digest the comments and pull together more specifics if we are going to charge her or tell her what she needs to improve. In response, another faculty member shared his perspective that this is not about not about indicting someone or about a charge, but rather that the ALO is a climate survey—a perceptual tool about how the president’s effectiveness and function is
judged by the campus community. A question was raised as to how the results would be released electronically. President Reece informed the body that it would be sent via email as a PDF. A few senators cautioned against not uploading it to the website for all the world to see. After a few people observed that students might not have ready access to the results, it was noted that the student paper was being represented at the meeting, and that there would probably be a story in the paper. Students who work on the paper were advised to get an electronic copy of the document, and if it were not made available elsewhere, that they make it available to the student newspaper. One senator, noting that something pertaining to the confidence issue was incorrectly reported, expressed a desire to have a faculty member or Faculty Senate look at the article before it is published. In response to a couple of comments made about the relationship between the ASCC executive branch and Talon Marks, ASCC Vice President, Michael Barrita, reported that they have spoken with Talon Marks and addressed issues they have had with them in the past. Legal consult about information as to how much information should be distributed to whom and where was suggested. President Reece stated he would consult with CCFF legal counsel with their permission. President Stolze was amenable to that. One senator noted that the Senate would probably not release a simple statement just saying it either has confidence or not, but that at some point it would present something more formal that would likely look like a resolution with specificity. President Reece responded affirmatively to a request that a digital version of written comments by the president, if submitted, be sent to the senators.

Speaking to a couple of comments pertaining to a desire for more specificity, one senator pointed out that the whole process started with specific concerns, and suggested the body look back at the beginning where there was a list of specific concerns. President Reece prefaced the discussion by summarizing ways items are placed on the Senate agenda: leadership discusses and identifies items in its executive meeting, Senators recommend items to be placed on the agenda, and divisions ask to place something on the agenda. Five divisions asked the Senate to place something on the agenda. Five divisions asked the Senate to place the vote of no confidence on the agenda. Two divisions asked the Senate to collect information. Information was collected. President Reece presented his opinion that the Senate has gone above standards in answering this kind of question, shared his inclination to put the question of confidence/no confidence on the agenda of the next Senate meeting, and explained that once it is on the agenda, the Senate can have a more formal document explaining what the vote means and what it is going to do. A few other faculty members offered additional comments. One noted that if the majority were to vote for the vote of concern, then the Senate would have to flesh out a list of concerns to forward to the Board of Trustees, but that she suspects that most people will vote for the no confidence option. Another shared his pride in how President Reece has handled the situation and in the levelheadedness of the body. He remarked that it is a sad day, and that the ALO tells a story of about eighty-five percent (of respondents) saying the president never or almost never meets their expectations. He encouraged the senators to think about what tenure means—that tenure is a high responsibility that comes to play when things are wrong. It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty member to speak truth to power. The Senate
President has to say what is going on, as deans and other managers sometimes cannot do that. He asserted that the Senate has to call the question, that the numbers on the ALO are staggering and heartbreaking, and that the body expects a response. He reminded the senators that they not only represent the faculty, but represent the best interests of all who are employed and enrolled at the college, and that the Board needs to hear the Senate body’s message. He concluded by commending the Senate for the great job it has done. Another senator reiterated that if the body ends up with a vote of concern, then there can be a list of what needs to be fixed. He also shared his opinion that this does serve as an indictment—that there is reason to believe a —crime[— has been committed, but that the Senate is not the jury, and in the end, the Board will have to say what it thinks. Finally, one last faculty member, sharing that he has heard the president say it is her belief that she is evaluated by seven people, pointed out that the ALO makes it clear that the president is constantly being evaluated by the entire community, and that the community is evaluating everyone all of the time. He also commended the Senate and President Reece in particular.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to adopt the recommended voting instrument for the Senate’s vote on confidence in the college president.

Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

2-26-08

Cerritos College President

President Reece announced that Dr. Vela has been scheduled for another meeting, but requested time at the top of the Senate meeting to make a statement. Before introducing Dr. Vela, President Reece explained that the Talon Marks asked to videotape the meeting, and asked the body for feedback.

Motion: It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Mellas (SEM) that the meeting not be videotaped.

Action: Motion was approved with 5 abstenions.

President Reece gave Dr. Vela the floor. Dr. Vela extended her appreciation to the Senate for its flexibility in its schedule. She acknowledged receipt of the Academic Leadership Outcomes survey, and noted that she was impressed by the tremendous amount of work that went behind it. She referred to a memo (email) that was sent to senators on the 25th, and explained that she has had a longstanding invitation to meet with and make a presentation for students in the Court Reporting program. Dr. Vela explained that the event is not just an annual banquet, but that it is for a special achievement for the students, as they have achieved a 100% passage rate in the state exam. She asked the body to understand her interest in honoring that commitment. Dr. Vela stated that she has asked for an opportunity to speak, and that she has been scheduled for the 14th
Voting on Confidence in Cerritos College President

President Reece called the body’s attention to a few documents that were furnished for the discussion. He read the email memo to which Dr. Vela had referred into the record: Greetings! Bryan, thank you for your understanding and concern for my mother’s health. I hope you are feeling better soon. I understand that you are out ill today. As I indicated to you in my February 15 e-mail message, I would like to take some time to communicate directly with you, the Faculty Senate and others. Since I have been scheduled to be at the Annual Court Reporting Banquet since February 6 to make a presentation on Tuesday, February 26 during the same time that the Senate meets, I do ask that a time be scheduled on March 11 for all of us to talk.

The allegations made that I re-wrote Standard IV of the Accreditation Self Study and that I gave misinformation two years ago regarding when the College could expect to receive the $30M from the State for the replacement of the Burnight Theatre are not based on fact and yet they are purported bases for the vote of no confidence. I’m interested in having a direct and open conversation to discuss the vote of no confidence, the ALO survey, expectations of each other, appropriate and inappropriate communication channels and most importantly to talk about where we, all of us, go from here. Your e-mail makes it appear that I have been non-responsive to the Faculty Senate. Bryan, prior to November, 2007 you would have called or stopped by to ask me to attend a Senate meeting and now you include the notice of an invitation in the body of minutes or on an agenda. The practice of calling and inviting someone to attend a Senate meeting is still being used with others but apparently not with me. People expect to be evaluated based on appropriate expectations, evidence and discussion before judgments and decisions are made. The value of an evaluation comes in the discussion. I ask what one of the senators asked at a Faculty Senate meeting: What are the charges? You and others appear to have a goal, perhaps goals that have not been shared with me. If your goal is to have change, then it would be productive to have us all talk directly about what that change entails for each of us. I have served the College well and have kept the best interest of the College and students in mind since I arrived here. There have been regular, announced and open opportunities for dialogue and participation in decision making and to say otherwise two years after decisions were made is neither accurate nor fair to all of us who participated in those processes. It may be closer to accurate to say that some do not like the outcomes and want the decisions re-considered; albeit two years later. Once again, I hope we can find time to communicate directly to work through this. Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to the opportunity to meet. President Reece reiterated that Dr. Vela expressed an interest in meeting with the Senate on 3/11/08. He shared his belief that the implied message is that she would like the Senate to postpone its vote on the issue of confidence until then, and identified that as being a decision to be made by the body. Before opening for discussion, President Reece called the body’s attention to two other documents: tables outlining various communications believe a pattern of non-response or delayed response and a timeline of public meetings; a timeline of votes by 11 divisions that have voted no confidence. After asking the senators to check the division votes for accuracy, a couple of senators provided clarifications or corrections.
President Reece opened the floor to discuss whether or not to go forward with the vote on confidence in Dr. Vela's leadership as planned or to postpone it until March 11th. One senator suggested move forward with the vote, as he did not think anything would change come March 11th. He also expressed his understanding that the vote is about Dr. Vela's leadership style, and acknowledged that it will still be up to the Board of Trustees to make any decisions. Another senator concurred and others nodded in agreement, and then a formal motion was put forth.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to go forward with the vote today (February 26th).

**Discussion:** Several senators and other faculty members offered comments and observations:

One senator stated that the president is still welcome to come back and talk to the Senate. He also wondered how a president could not know the seriousness of the vote of no confidence and not respond sooner.

Another senator made it clear that even though some changes have been made, his division's position (of having no confidence in the president) has not changed. He expressed opinions about the function of the Campus Transformation Committee, and pointed to the Program Review process as being the faculty's tool to move the institution forward.

It was suggested that with all of the complaints about communication, the Senate might look bad having let the president leave the meeting after asking for an opportunity to speak (at a future meeting).

Referencing the email memo the president sent, one senator observed that it does not reflect someone who is really open to communication. She also shared her belief that the last minute statement to the Senate was manipulative, that the president has done everything to not communicate and push the Senate back, and that it is essential to vote prior to accreditation to make clear where we stand.

Another faculty member shared his belief that the email memo the president sent diminishes what this is all about. This is about much larger material than the two points referenced in the memo about standard four of the accreditation self-study and funding of the theatre. He also made the point that the vote is part of the communication with the president, and that when she does come to the Senate, she needs to understand where the body stands.

It was pointed out that the Senate will need to consider implications in terms of looking at the campus community. The same vigilance needs to be put forth in looking at the other side of the vote with respect to the process and communication with the Board. The president has not been working in isolation, and the Senate has a responsibility to
monitor decisions to come, and be included in the discussion of whatever decision the Board needs to make.

**Action:** Motion was approved with a vote of 27-1. Ballots were distributed, marked by senators, and collected. President Reece read the votes; the Senate clerk tallied the votes. The results were as follows:

24 votes for "no confidence"

4 votes for "concern"

1 vote for "confidence"

President Reece announced that the Faculty Senate officially votes no confidence in the leadership of Dr. Vela, and proceeded to read the statement that accompanied the no confidence option on the ballot. Noting that such an outcome was suspected, President Reece distributed and read a draft of a resolution that could be forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) to approve the resolution. **Discussion:** There was discussion about some of the language in the resolution. The body agreed to the following changes:

Change “ten divisions” to “eleven divisions” and add Student Services.

Delete statement that mentions CCFF.

Change “yes,” “no,” and “abstain” to “no confidence,” “concern,” and “confidence.”

Include statement about Dr. Vela initiating communication with the Senate regarding the ALO and vote of no confidence one time, and just prior to the Senate meeting.

Replace “immediately remove” with “seriously consider removal of.”

Delete statement that mentions severance pay. This change generated some debate, with some senators asserting that the Board should be made aware that the Senate would be okay with severance pay if that is what they choose to do, and other senators asserting that the Senate should have no involvement with the issue of severance pay. A straw poll was taken, and a clear majority was in favor of deleting the statement.

**Action:** Motion unanimously approved as amended. Another motion was put forth in response to a desire expressed earlier in the meeting about somehow letting the Board know they should talk to the faculty, and not just administration, to understand our concerns and why the Senate voted the way it did. **Motion:** It was moved by Senator Asperen (Technology) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to recommend
that President Reece bring forward all concerns of all of the divisions to the Board of Trustees. **Action:** Motion was unanimously approved.

**3-4-08**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson and seconded by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) to approve the minutes of 2/26/08. **Action:** Motion was unanimously approved.

**Reports**

**CCFF Liaison (Ted Stolze)**

President Stolze distributed copies of two documents: a resolution by the CCFF Executive Board supporting the Senate’s resolution of no confidence, and a bargaining update. President Stolze expressed frustration over the fact that the union has been without a full contract for six years. He noted that the union had finally decided it had to use legal means to get bargaining going in a way it should have been going six years ago, and filed PERB charges. But, after meeting in January, they decided to put those charges in abeyance as a good faith gesture, hoping this would facilitate serious bargaining. The first couple of encounters with the District’s team in February seemed to indicate they could find common ground. However, the tone dramatically changed. President Stolze asserted his opinion that the District wasted the time of not just the union, but all of the faculty members. They plan to give the District one more chance on Monday to show a good faith effort, otherwise will reopen PERB charges, and are willing to bargain to impasse. President Stolze contended that this is not just about salary, but that it is about vindicating the rights of faculty, and that they are just asking to be treated as professionals. The update document he provided provides a breakdown of the District’s proposal on assignment, calendar, etc. President Stolze expressed his desire to have a full contract as soon as reasonably possible, and surmised that at this rate, it could take as much as a dozen years, which is unacceptable. President Stolze emphatically stated that injury to one is injury to all—an injury to one faculty member, is an injury to all faculty members; an injury to one department, is an injury to all departments; an injury to one division, is an injury to all divisions; and the injury to the union, is an injury to the Senate. In the spirit of the Compact of Mutual Understanding and Support between the Senate and the CCFF, he asked the Senate for support with a resolution the union’s request that the District sign a Memorandum of Understanding to release COLA retroactive to July 1, 2007 without any other restrictions on continued bargaining over salary and benefits. He explained that this is possible, and was done last fall with health insurance, and that in the union’s best judgment, the District is holding COLA as a bargaining chip to delay the process.

In response to a question about the District’s proposed increase in office hours, President Stolze explained that the District calculated the total work hours to be 40,
distributed as follows: 15 hours in class, 15 hours for prep, 5 hours for professional responsibilities (including work on student learning outcomes), and 5 hours dedicated to office hours for meeting with students. The CCFF’s counter is to maintain status quo: 3 hours. President Stolze noted that the office hours issue can be bargained, but the COLA issue is different—that it is not something that should be argued about. Once COLA is released, then they can work on finding common ground on other issues such as assignment and calendar. One of the senators wondered if the District’s proposed limitation on online teaching loads was because the Board realizes how difficult online teaching is. President Stolze, acknowledging that he could not speak for the Board, explained that the union’s bargaining teams solicits advice from faculty. He explained that bargaining is a process by which both sides come to the table to with what they want and decide on a compromise, and that it should be an expression of shared governance. There will be debate and disagreements, but the hope is to find common ground. President Stolze asserted that the CCFF and Senate should be working together as a unified faculty. Senator Obasohan (Humanities/Social Sciences) expressed a desire to put forth a motion, but a question came up about whether or not a motion could be made from a report. It was clarified that an item can be placed immediately on the agenda by a two-thirds majority vote.

**Motion:** It was moved by Secretary Ukita (Counseling) and seconded by Senator Obasohan to place the item on the agenda.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Obasohan and seconded by Senator Marks (Health Occupations), in the spirit of the Compact of Mutual Understanding and Support, the Senate support the union in its request for the release of COLA.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.

**ALO/Vote of No Confidence Update**

President Reece explained the Senate leadership is recommending a procedural correction to last week’s vote. He provided the following background information. Last week, the Senate turned down a request from Talon Marks to video record the meeting. After the meeting, Talon Marks advisor, Rich Cameron sent an email, which was not at all contentious, explaining that the Brown Act allows for video recording, so long as it does not interrupt the meeting. Secretary Ukita double-checked the Brown Act, and confirmed the point about video recording. While looking for that information, she also found language in the Brown Act essentially saying there cannot be private votes on actionable items. Last week’s vote was done by private ballot. In addition, a current senator and a former senator also expressed concern about the private vote. President Reece reported that Senate leadership communicated with the state Academic Senate office, explained that there was a secret ballot for senators to select an option pertaining to confidence in the president, but a public vote on the resolution stating no confidence, and determined that we are probably okay because of the grey area pertaining to
whether the secret ballot was an actionable item. President Reece suggested that if the Senate wants to be clear, it should consider voting again in a public way. He posed the question: Should the Senate re-vote today? He made clear that if the Senate elects to re-vote, the results do not have to be the same as last week, and senators can change their minds. He shared the recommendation of Senate leadership to vote again.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Obasohan and seconded by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) that the Senate re-vote in a public way.

**Discussion:** Several senators and other faculty members offered comments and observations. One shared that other faculty had expressed concern about the secret ballot to him, and pointed out that with eleven divisions voting no confidence, division representatives should be able to stand up and be public with their vote. Another noted that the Senate has always been public. And, another posed a question as to whether or not the vote will overturn the prior vote. Tied to this discussion, he also expressed his disappointment with the closed session process from the last Senate meeting in which an academic accommodation appeal was considered. He explained that he was unhappy and uncomfortable with that procedure, because he felt he was voting out of ignorance on the issue, and stated his desire to see that vote overturned. So as not to get the issues confused, it was requested to separate the issue of the accommodations appeal from the issue at hand. The discussion turned back to whether or not the new vote would overturn the prior vote, and the motion was modified.

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Obasohan and seconded by Senator Trager (Fine Arts/Communications) that the Senate re-vote in a public way and have the results replace the previous vote.

**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved. President Reece called for the senators to identify their vote on the issue of confidence: confidence, concern, no confidence, or abstain. Senators raised their hands to identify their votes with the following results:

- 0 for —confidence
- 3 for —concern
- 24 for —no confidence
- 0 abstentions

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Hallinger (SEM) and seconded by Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) that the numbers on the resolution be revised and the resolution be reaffirmed. **Action:** Motion was approved unanimously.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Moriarty (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business Education) to approve the minutes of 3/4/08. Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: It was moved by Senator Soden (Business Education) and seconded by Senator Juntilla (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of 3/11/08. Action: Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.

CCFF

Senator Namala provided background information on the discussion item. Noting the negotiation efforts going on between the CCFF and the District, he thought it might be a good idea to have the senators sign a petition of support that the union could bring to the April 1st bargaining session. Motion: It was moved by Secretary Ukita (Counseling) and seconded by Senator Johnson (Technology) to place the item on the agenda for discussion. Discussion: Clarification was asked as to how this would be different than the resolution the Senate recently passed. It was explained that the previous resolution was specific to supporting the CCFF in its request of a Memorandum of Understanding on the release of COLA. Action: Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention. A suggestion was made to draft a resolution. Senator Namala distributed language he had drafted for the possible petition. In response to a question, President Stolze confirmed that the notion of an MOU on COLA has been summarily dismissed by the District. It was recommended that the language from Senator Namala’s proposed petition be drafted in the form of a resolution, which would be placed on the agenda for the next Senate meeting. There was a suggestion to include language in the second bullet that reflects the Senate’s understanding that an MOU is something that could have been done. It was also suggested that some contextualization be added to frame why the Senate is adding its voice to this issue.

UNION RESOLUTION

Senator Fernandez (Humanities/Social Sciences) read a proposed resolution in support of the CCFF, as a follow up to the previous week’s Senate meeting. Motion: It was moved by Senator Johnson (Technology) and seconded by Senator Soden (Business
Education) to adopt the resolution. **Discussion:** A discussion of approximately 20 minutes followed, during which time several suggestions were made as to how to modify the resolution. Many suggestions with respect to language were made. There was much discussion on whether or not the resolution should focus just on the issue of COLA or on the combination of COLA and a fair contract. Straw polls were taken to determine the interest of the body. Based on consensus, the following was determined:

Should be sent to the Board of Trustees from the Faculty Senate with today’s date.

Delete second whereas statement.

Delete references to —comprehensive‖ or —fair contract‖—deal with fair contract separately.

Include reference to fact that COLA has been released to all except faculty.

Delete —encourage‖ in resolved statement.

Include reference to the purpose of COLA.

Senator Hu, Senator Namala, President Stolze, and the Senate Executive Board worked on editing and forwarding the resolution as the will of the body.

**Action:** Motion was approved (21 ayes; 2 nays; 0 abstentions). A suggestion to generate another resolution that addresses the issue of a comprehensive contract was made and supported by the body.

4-8-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson and seconded by Senator Hu (Liberal Arts) to approve the minutes of 3/25/08.  
**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.  
**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson and seconded by Senator Hallinger (SEM) to approve the minutes of 4/1/08.  
**Action:** Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.

4-22-08

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** It was moved by Senator Wilson (SEM) and seconded by Senator Breit to approve the minutes of 4/8/08. **Action:** Motion was unanimously approved save one abstention.