<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asperen</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breit</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fobi</td>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Student Senate Liaison (Non Voting)</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallinger</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntilla</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewandowski</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewandowski</td>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>HPER/Athletics</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellas</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Library (Vice President)</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namala</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negrete</td>
<td>Bernie</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obasohan</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Elizabeth (Liz)</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reece</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Humanities/Social Sciences (President)</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soden</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolze</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>CCFF Liaison (Non Voting)</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trager</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Fine Arts/Communications</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukita</td>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>Counseling (Secretary)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedell</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: Dr. Bob Hughlett, Dr. Noelia Vela, Bill Farmer, M.L. Bettino, Dr. Connie Mayfield, Carolyn Chambers, Renee Chomiak, Dr. Kay Follett, Bob Chester, Lynn Laughon, Peter Nguyen
The meeting began at 11:06 a.m. The flag salute was led by Senator Wilson (SEM).

Secretary Ukita reminded the body that there will be no Senate meeting next week.

President Stolze reported that the CCFF and the District negotiating teams met for four hours yesterday. They tried to address the desire to sign a Memorandum of Understanding on COLA, and to have it release retroactive to July 1, 2007. The concern that the District had communicated that doing so would violate ground rules was rejected at the beginning of bargaining. President Stolze appealed to the senators to encourage them to attend the next Board meeting. He circulated a flyer suggesting that faculty contact Board members by phone or email, and/or attend the next Board meeting on the 19th. He also reported that CSEA ratified their full contract, which included full COLA. President Stolze emphasized the importance of making it clear to the Board that the union has the full support of the faculty. President Reece noted that not only has CSEA settled their bargaining agreements, but salary settlements have also been made with managers, contract employees and confidential employees have as well.

Senator Lee thanked President Reece for going to the Student Senate meeting last week. He also reported that someone from the Foundation office presented information to the Student Senate about grant monies available to students, and asked that faculty let students know. He announced that Hoe Down Days activities were taking place this week. Senator Lee additionally reported that only 6 student organizations turned in budget proposals, and that the rest of the clubs will probably not get any funding from the ASCC. He acknowledged the dental hygiene club for the detailed proposal they submitted.

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.

The request for a faculty member to serve on the committee will go out to the entire campus. The committee meets on the first Thursday of each month at 1:00 p.m.
Election of Officers
Nominations for officers of the Senate are due 4/8/08. Elections are scheduled for 4/22/08.

Outstanding Senator of the Year
Nominations are due 4/22/08. Elections are scheduled for 4/29/08. Presentation is scheduled for 5/6/08.

Academic Excellence Awards
The Academic Excellence Awards event will take place on Tuesday, 3/25/08 at 7:00 p.m. in the Burnight Center and Board Room.

Outstanding Faculty Awards
The Outstanding Faculty Awards event will take place on Thursday, 4/17/08 at 11:00 a.m. in the Student Center. A list of the faculty members who will be receiving an award was distributed.

General Faculty Meeting
The next general faculty meeting will take place on Thursday, 3/27/08 at 11:00 a.m. in the Teleconference Center. President Reece reported that three items are going to be introduced at this meeting: 1) student learning plan; 2) first draft of the developmental education plan; and 3) teaching excellence. In regard to the teaching excellence item, President Reece expressed an interest in beginning discussion on the idea of excellence in the classroom in a positive, affirmative manner that would encompass all approaches and aspire to excellence. President Reece asked senators to promote the event to their colleagues.

UPDATE ON THE AGENDA FOR STUDENT SUCCESS
President Reece furnished copies of an update on the Agenda for Student Success, and briefly went over most items:

- Student Learning Plan – A draft will be presented to the campus at the next general faculty meeting on the 27th.
- Part-time Hiring Procedures – Congratulations to the members of the Equivalency and Local Standards Committee for organizing a recent training session.
- Program Review – The committee is transitioning from the leadership of Lynn Serwin (Liberal Arts) to Mark Fronke (Business Education).
- ALO Assessment – Nearing completion. Dr. Vela will speak today.
- Instructional Space – This was recently discussed at a Facilities Planning Committee meeting. Committee members Senator Negrete (SEM) and Senator Ernest (Liberal Arts) provided a brief report. At the meeting, they presented the desire to come up with some standards to do an assessment and inventory of facilities across campus, so that informed decisions about where to put efforts and resources can be made. The discussion will continue at the next FPC meeting. In response to questions posed, Senator Ernest reported that open spaces on campus are also being considered. He suggested that the inventory would allow us to have a benchmark from which to start, and noted that there has been discussion on generating a digital catalog of everything, including rooms used by the ASCC. President Reece indicated that the goal is to identify instructional spaces and get a sense of their quality, and then to come up with some sort of plan to bring spaces up to quality. He acknowledged that we would not have the money to do this all at once and would take multiple years, but the point is to have a plan and process in place to get spaces up to quality and maintain them. In response to a question about whether or not the
committee will be looking into the maintenance of the spaces in terms of cleanliness, Senator Ernest noted that is one of the responsibilities of the committee.

- Academic IT Resource – There was good discussion last week on TalonNet.
- State of Education Address – The meeting on the 27th will serve as a follow up.
- Senate Budget Proposal – President Reece had a good meeting with Senator Namala (Humanities/Social Sciences) and Professor Fronke (Business Education) regarding budget recommendations to open up dialog on the budget process.
- College Strategic Plan – The Senate previously adopted a memo to suggest to Planning & Budget how to proceed with strategic planning. There was good discussion at the last meeting; good recommendations were offered for improving the plan.

President Reece noted that there has not been a lot of movement on the following Agenda for Student Success items: Enrollment flexibility plan, faculty handbook, transfer success, and career and technical education. He expressed an intention to start working on them again after spring break.

President Reece pointed out a list of accomplishments on the update handout, and asked the senators to read it on their own time. He also asked that they let him know if they want to get more involved in any of the areas.

**SENATE DISCUSSION**

*ALO/Vote of No Confidence*

President Reece reminded the body that President Vela as well as the Senate requested time to talk about the ALO survey. He explained that she has a touch of laryngitis, expressed his appreciation for her coming to the Senate, and then turned the floor over to her to address the body.

*The following is meant to summarize the over one hour discussion that took place. Audio recordings of the entire discussion are available in the Faculty Senate office.*

President Vela thanked the Senate for the invitation to have a conversation as well as for understanding about her voice, indicated she has been reading about some of the Senate’s work throughout the year, acknowledged that the Senate is the body that works on the academic agenda, and shared that she is pleased with the work the Senate is doing. She then indicated that she would like to ask some questions, and then share some comments.

President Vela noted that in her written response to the ALO (email memo to senators dated 2/25/08) she had asked questions. She then posed the question: What is the goal of the Academic Senate? She clarified that she did not mean the goal of the Senate as a body, but with the recent activity of the survey and votes of no confidence. In response, President Reece shared that the main goal for the survey was to respond to divisions. In November 2007, the Fine Arts/Communications division asked the Senate to conduct a campus wide vote of no confidence. Within a week or so, two
divisions voted no confidence and asked the Senate to support that. This required the Senate to address the issue. President Reece then talked to other divisions, and three of them asked that before the Senate conducts a vote that more information be gathered. The fall semester ended with six divisions requesting either the Senate conduct a vote on confidence or some kind of information collection process to precede a vote. President Reece explained that his goal was to respond to divisions asking the Senate to address the vote of no confidence and collect data. By the time the Senate got to the actual vote, all of the divisions came to the same conclusion. The goal was to establish a process to help the community reach some kind of determination. One senator verbalized her agreement and others nodded. Another shared her opinion that the goal is to have clear communication between what is going on on campus, what we see is important for students and do not see happening, and more of a shared governance type of process. One other senator explained that the ALO was not viewed as something that would be used one time, but would be something to institute yearly to raise awareness, address concerns, address questions, and take the pulse of the community.

President Vela shared her observation that the process differed in this situation. She shared her understanding that when there is a concern or question, the practice has been to invite individuals to discuss that in the Senate. She noted that at no time did anybody from any of the divisions ask for a conversation to share some of this information. Some of it was a surprise and brand new. She observed that there have been numerous times others were brought in to talk about concerns such as FERPA, prerequisites, the facilities planning process, and TalonNet. She shared her disappointment and belief that actions were taken without opportunity for discussion. She firmly stated she did not write Standard IV nor direct it to be rewritten. She also asserted that she did not mislead or intend to mislead the Fine Arts/Communication division regarding the Burnight replacement. She explained that she had met with the division, and said there was good news and frustrating news—that the state approved the replacement, but that we would have to wait until the next state bond measure, which was estimated at the time to be fall of 2008. President Vela addressed these two issues in particular, because they were the two initial reasons for the vote of no confidence. She observed that more information was not asked for, and there was not an opportunity for exchange and discussion. She communicated her support of trying to improve communication and shared governance, noted she was disappointed that we got off track, and stated that her goal is to get on track. President Vela again shared her observation that opportunity was not given, and also noted that it was interesting that all of this occurred and there was a snowball effect right after Board elections.

President Vela proceeded to ask the senators if they would like to have had an evaluation based upon allegations and misinformation without an opportunity for discussion and clarification and an interest in having data driven decisions. She asked them to consider how they would have felt at the receiving end, and declared that it does not feel good. She posed the question: What are the allegations? She shared that she has been pained, disappointed, and that it feels like an attack and an ambush. President Vela then expressed her interest in making a commitment to where do we go from here. She further asserted that there was a judgment without
opportunity for discussion, that processes to ensure that all versions are addressed were not followed, and that there were misconceptions and misinformation. She noted that the process of a vote of no confidence is a one-way communication tool. It is in essence a proclamation and a decision, and she shared that she has heard that decisions had been made a long time ago. She expressed her interest in honesty and truth, and asked what the real intent and real goal are. She noted that one of the comments and allegations was that there were not opportunities for participation in discussions before recommendations were made to the Board, but all of the evidence indicates otherwise. She said she understands the desire to have things reconsidered, but asking to have things reconsidered did not happen, and instead allegations were made that were not supported by evidence. She provided an example of reconsideration of a decision: Based on new information that the college would receive 30 million from the state, the master plan was reconsidered.

President Vela expressed a concern about one way communication and a hope for a commitment to improve our communication and shared governance. She also referred to comments in the ALO, expressing her belief that most were opinion not supported by fact, and then asked: What are the expectations, and what would she need to do differently to meet them?

President Reece agreed that an exclusionary process for the assessment was not desired. This was discussed in the Senate, and is why the Senate believes President Vela was given opportunities for input. He explained that up to the day the Senate voted, there were approximately 21 communications to her. Input was solicited—two were specific requests made to her to comment on the actual development of the instrument. President Reece suggested that they agree to disagree on that point. He then referred to the ALO survey, noting that there were six outcome areas, each with between 6-10 indicators. He asked President Vela if she agreed with any of the 48 items, and if so, which ones.

President Vela acknowledged there were opportunities to participate, but that was after it was decided (by the Senate) there would be an evaluation. She noted that while she values feedback, it is the Board and not the Senate who evaluates her, and that there was not an opportunity for discussion before decisions were made. She expressed a desire to have a discussion about moving towards resolution, and again asked what the Senate’s expectations are and what she has to do differently. In response, President Reece pointed out that the items on the ALO identify 48 expectations. President Vela again expressed her interest in having a discussion.

The discussion continued for approximately 40 more minutes, during which time senators and other faculty members shared observations, expressed concerns, and directed comments to the president:

- A formal invitation is not required to attend Senate meetings.
- Three of the top four concerns identified in the ALO have to do with the faculty union and collective bargaining. The president should be an advocate of all of the faculty. The president has not
demonstrated a willingness to say to the Board that the union is just as important as the Senate. Would like to hear a public acknowledgement of the faculty union as an important part of shared governance.

- The Senate did an assessment—it was not an evaluation.
- The president is never seen on campus.
- There were 48 items on the ALO, which was the entire campus speaking up, and she has not been able to respond to any of them. People said (in the ALO) the president does not take accountability, does not respect others, ignores shared governance, and tends to see ulterior motives behind what people say. There were 21 times in which there was opportunity to respond.
- One example meant to demonstrate the president’s style was given by a senator: the hiring process for a political science professor. The senator asserted that the president ignored a process that was in place, which he thought was rude. He suggested that she understand that faculty need to be respected and consulted, and that she take some accountability.
- A president is a leader who shows vision and sets the standard to which the rest of us aspire. Financial decisions have been made that do not reflect what should be the core mission: student success. President Vela asked for clarification. The senator explained that with respect to the design of new classroom building for SEM, the astronomy department asked if it could put in certain facilities, and were told no. When they asked if they were to find funds elsewhere, they were still told no and that space would not be provided. President Vela noted that the information was new to her, though it should not be. She mentioned that the users group of each project is given budget information. She expressed her belief that it is not necessarily too late for that, and that she will have to look into it. She noted this as an example of why she wanted to talk about information and potential misinformation.
- Numerous hours were spent on the development of the ALO, and great care was taken in creating a survey that identifies the expectations of the president as articulated by the community, and in measuring them. President Reece read some of the expectations articulated in the ALO, and noted that they all had a predominance of community members saying she either never meets expectations or almost never meets expectations. In response, President Vela pointed out that the community would not have participated in some of the areas, and she is not sure all of the information is known by everyone to make a judgment. She asked, “Where do we go from here?” and expressed her desire to move forward. This prompted one of the senators to pronounce her disbelief that President Vela was not taking any responsibility. President Vela acknowledged there are real feelings that were expressed in the ALO, that some of it is based on incomplete information. She acknowledged that she needs to improve communication, is making an effort, and is asking what else she can do.
- President Vela’s courage to face the Senate was acknowledged.
- Using Standard IV as an example, one senator made the point that in the end, the buck stops with the president, so she is still held accountable. In response to the president’s perception that the
survey is not backed by facts, he pointed out that the survey provides data and is a reflection of people’s feelings that are material and cannot be disregarded as not being factually based. He suggested that something she can do to move forward is to have the MOU on COLA signed. In response, President Vela agreed that feelings were shared (in the ALO) and she is not disregarding them. With respect to the accreditation report, she reiterated that there has been a tremendous amount of change at the college in a very short period of time, such as going from a non-union environment to a union environment. She noted that she has been a union member herself, and firmly stated that she is not anti-union and supports their work. The basis of negotiations is different than meet and confer. Other changes that have taken place in a short period of time include PeopleSoft, personnel, prerequisite checking, accreditation standards, and class and compensation study, some of which were set in motion before new administrations came.

- The ALO was a response to some divisions’ requests for more information. The SEM division did not want to move forward until there was more information. The Senate went to extremes to gather information and create the survey, and it is hoped that the process could be used on an annual basis regardless of who is president.
- There was an excellent opportunity at the November Senate meeting the president attended for the Standard IV discussion to stand up and say she is responsible for what her vice presidents do, will take responsibility, and will see that it gets fixed, but she did not do anything. One of the senators expressed his disappointment that she did not take advantage of that opportunity, and after expressing appreciation for her attendance at the day’s meeting, bluntly stated that she is “a day late, and a dollar short,” dumbfounded that she had not come sooner.
- The ALO gave voice back to the campus. The Senate a gave voice to be heard. Before moving forward, it would be nice if the president acknowledge on some of the items that she has made mistakes.
- When the vote was on the agenda two weeks ago, the president should not have gone to the previous engagement she had. It was suggested that she have some managers who can more easily say no to her. President Vela explained that our first purpose for being here is our students. The event she attended was not a party—it was a celebration of a major accomplishment of the court reporting students. She acknowledged that there are a lot of areas for improvement, that she has taken a lot of time reading the ALO and doing a lot of soul-searching, and that she has made mistakes and that she is not the only one. She again expressed her interest in discussing where to go from here.
- In response to a comment that the campus is frustrated, and as the president and leader of the college, it is her call as far as how to go forward, President Vela emphasized that there is a collective responsibility, and that it is not one person’s responsibility, although she will take responsibility.
- A letter was sent a couple of years ago to the Board from the
exiting Faculty Senate president outlining concerns with the college president. Many of the concerns were the same as those expressed in the ALO. We need to move out of the framework that this is a new problem since November, and understand there has been faculty concern for some time.

- There is a disparate perception of the ALO, with constituent groups seeing it one way and the president seeing it another. The survey provides the president with perceptions of constituent groups. Concerns are listed in the survey, and some response to them is needed.

- Our expectations are that the primary leadership of the campus should be addressing the primary six areas identified on the survey.

- The Senate has identified goals (the Agenda for Student Success), and it would be interesting to see the president’s vision, if it works with any of the Senate’s goals, and if there can be collaboration to achieve the goals.

- It was surprising to see that administrators were harder on the president than the faculty (in the ALO). If the administrators do not have a true picture of what is going on, who does?

- In response to a comment about there being opportunity to try to stop the process before now, President Vela explained that she did ask President Reece for an opportunity to talk at a Senate meeting, but basically the process was on its way, and she clearly received the message that it was not going to be stopped. President Reece insisted that she was given several opportunities to participate, but she did not take advantage of them.

- Comments made by Dr. Scroggins during the accreditation presentation were presented. One of the senators shared that he was unprepared for such comments coming from an outside, objective evaluator that echoed some of the concerns the faculty have had.

- The previous Faculty Senate president, Bob Chester, wrote a letter to President Vela, which was also shared with the Board, back in June of 2006, after talking to the president several times about how her conduct was being perceived on campus. Professor Chester read parts of the letter, which identified various concerns related to her leadership style, morale on campus, working relationships, and the environment that has been created on campus. He asserted that he repeatedly told her that the way people were being treated was not working. He emphasized that this is not a new issue. It did not start in November, but two years ago. The ALO responses are not merely feelings—there was a lot of thought that went into them, and people think she has not provided good leadership. Professor Chester expressed his belief that she has had abundant opportunity to hear from people. He noted that the best people on campus who wanted her to succeed have turned away from her, and expressed his regret that this had to happen.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Faculty Senate Secretary, Traci Ukita.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE 3-25-08**
For further details of the meeting, audio recordings are available in the Faculty Senate office located in the Office of Academic Affairs.
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