Revisions to Existing Agenda Items

**CONSENT CALENDAR - REVISIONS TO ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24.  | Employment of Classified, Short-Term, Substitute, Professional Expert, and/or Student Hourly Personnel as Needed for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Academic Year (Office of Human Resources)  
**Added by revision:**  
Library Technical Specialist (Library), Classified Salary Schedule: Grade 29L, Step 2 ($4,831.16/month), promotion effective: August 18, 2016: Daisy Valdivia |
| 27.  | Employment of Full-Time, First-Year Contract (Probationary) (Office of Human Resources)  
**Added by revision:**  
Quilizapa, Claudia, Counselor (Counseling & Guidance), Column B, Step 3, Faculty Salary Schedule ($70,508.40/annual), 12-School Month Contract, effective August 23, 2016 |
The job description has been revised and is attached. |
| 32.  | New Classified Job Classifications and Descriptions (CSEA) (Office of Human Resources)  
It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the establishment of the new classified job classifications and descriptions for Sign Language Interpreter and Public Affairs Specialist. |

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS – REVISION TO ITEM 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 35.  | Consideration of Approval of Board Resolution No. 16-0817A Accepting the Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee Regarding the Complaints of Trustees Arthur and Drayer and Resolving to Reprimand Trustee Drayer for Violating Board Policy 2715.9.C. And 2715.10 (Office of the President)  
This item has been revised. |
Cerritos College

Position Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Salary Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accessibility Compliance Specialist</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Assess and recommend web application, devices, and technology-based applications with regard to accessibility compliance. Provide technical support and consultation to faculty and staff regarding access to electronic information and technology (EIT) by faculty, staff, students and members of the public who have disabilities and require access to distance education, alternate media, adaptive computer technology and other electronic information and communications services of Cerritos College; advise on institutional processes to ensure faculty, staff, and students with disabilities have timely access to state-of-the art adaptive computer technology and alternate media required for successful access.

**Distinguishing Career Features**

The Senior Accessibility Compliance Specialist reports to the Director of Information Technology. Support the District’s accessibility of electronic and information technology by serving as a source of subject matter expertise, conducting assessments, implementing testing processes, providing remediation recommendations, and conducting software reviews. Improve accessibility of existing technology and follow technical standards to ensure compliance with District, Local, State, and Federal access regulations and requirements.

**Essential Duties and Responsibilities**

- Advise on development and implementation of processes to meet institutional compliance with ADA law and sections 504/508 of the Rehabilitation Act, Section 255 Guidelines, and other access to EIT regulations.
- Provide consultation regarding faculty, staff, and students with disabilities to access electronic information such as closed/open captioning, kiosks, teleconferencing, audio description, or phone services.
- Provide one-on-one and/or group training and support for faculty, staff and students in the areas of access technology, alternate media, distance education, electronic information and adaptive accommodations for faculty, staff, and students with disabilities.
- Install, configure, operate and demonstrate adaptive technology and provide instructional/technical support for staff in the Adaptive Technology Classrooms and Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) Computer Lab.
- Evaluate web-based instructional materials and determine level of accessibility and necessary technology for gaining equal access.
Act as primary contact person to staff and faculty for questions related to institutional EIT, alternate media, access to distance education and electronic content for individuals with disabilities.

Communicate and interface with the college Information Technology support team, instructional computer lab coordinators, faculty, staff, and students regarding digital access to campus on-line courses, instructional materials, and student support services.

Assist, advise, and test accessibility compliance for EIT purchase requests and recommend accessibility standards for software, equipment, and components.

Recommend installation and configuration of approved access technology equipment and software across campus.

Participate in installing and configuring upgrades to existing assistive technology that enhance continuous operations, desired performance, and service.

Participate in troubleshooting to resolve assistive technology and operations problems. Assist and advise in the design of equally effective alternative solutions.

Survey the current access technology on campus and collaborate with Information Technology to develop an access technology plan.

Identify, evaluate, test and recommend for purchase, specific access technology software, hardware and/or other technology services.

Assist in performing research and development with new access technology that may be suitable for implementation within the district.

Assist in coordinating computer needs with the production of information in alternate formats for the institution.

Provide statistical reports based on service delivery, problem resolution and trends in EIT use.

Assist campus departments, divisions and/or administrative units to identify and incorporate access needs into their comprehensive planning process.

Work collaboratively with Human Resources to make accommodation recommendations pertaining to EIT for faculty and staff.

Participate on college committees/organizational units to counsel on EIT access.

May train and work with hourly and student workers who are engaged in access technical support.

Maintain currency of knowledge and skills related to the duties and responsibilities.

Perform other related duties as assigned.

**Qualifications**

- **Knowledge and Skills**

  Evaluation and assessment of individuals with disabilities regarding alternate access
to various types of electronic information and technology. Web access for individuals with disabilities. Current computer, web based, and access technologies. Campus standard application software. Training methods and practices in the use of assistive technologies. Alternate media formats and use (e.g. brailling, large print, audio, captioning). Accessibility guidelines and laws for individuals with disabilities (ADA, Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act; Section 255 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended) alternate media, distance education and electronic information including the Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards, Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) and the Assistive Technology Act of 1998. Understand the protocols and procedures for setting up new equipment and installation of software, and troubleshooting and performing routine maintenance. Requires sufficient communication skills to provide individual instruction and technical assistance on accessibility of electronic and information technology. Requires sufficient writing skills to document technical procedures.

- **Abilities**

  Analyze and solve complex and difficult accessibility problems. Assist and advise in the development of equally effective alternative solutions for accessibility to EIT. Install, program, configure, and maintain adaptive software programs and devices. Establish and maintain effective communications and working relationships among adaptive technology users. Maintain friendly and supportive atmosphere for students, faculty, staff and the public. Communicate effectively orally and in writing. Accurately research accessibility issues related to curriculum, distance education, electronic and non-electronic sources of information and the production of alternate media available for persons with disabilities. Interact effectively with faculty, staff and students, and demonstrate sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds of students with physical and learning disabilities. Collaborate with staff and faculty to customize technology and design equally effective alternative solutions for students with disabilities in an instructional/lab setting. Develop and deliver presentations. Conduct effective meetings. Collect data, compile reports, and meet deadlines. Requires the ability to work cooperatively and productively with others.

- **Physical Abilities**

  Requires ambulatory ability to move to various office, computer lab and classroom-type locations and to bend, stoop, and crawl to reach and/or install cables and equipment. Ability to sit for extended periods of time to accomplish data input and desk work. Requires sufficient hand eye coordination and dexterity to configure and maintain adaptive devices for computer access. Requires sufficient visual acuity to read technical documents and instructions. Requires the ability to lift, push, and pull objects of light weight up to 45 pounds on an occasional basis.

- **Education and Experience**

  The position requires a Bachelor’s degree in computer science or related technical field and three years experience with adaptive computer technology (software and hardware). Additional experience in accessibility of electronic and information
technology may substitute for some higher education. Knowledge of Americans with Disabilities Act and sections 504/508 of the Rehabilitation Act.

- **Licenses and Certificates**
  May require a valid driver’s license.

**Working Conditions**

Work is performed indoors where minimal safety considerations exist from physical labor, and positioning and handling of light weight, yet, awkward materials.
SUBJECT: Consideration of Approval of New Classified Job Classifications and Descriptions (CSEA)

ACTION
It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the establishment of the new classified job classifications and descriptions for Sign Language Interpreter (Grade 45, $5,292-$6,383), and Public Affairs Specialist, (Grade 38, $4,496-$5,407).

FISCAL IMPACT
The Sign Language Interpreter position may or may not have a financial impact depending on DSPS funds available to cover interpreting services. The Public Affairs Specialist is to be funded by District general fund. The estimated additional annual cost for the position is $2,830.23.

REPORT SUMMARY
Sign Language Interpreter. DSPS serves over 60 students who are deaf and use interpreters in their classes. Interpreting services are legally mandated by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and must be qualified to interpret for the specific class/subject. The number of deaf students has increased by 15% over the last 5 years. Hourly Interpreters (short-term) may only work 25 hours per week, 1000 hours per year and 175 days per academic year. These limits hinder continuity of service mid semester for a particular class. Due to the shortage of interpreters, and the limitations in hiring hourly Interpreters, DSPS must rely on Sign Language Interpreting Agencies. The cost of these services can range from $60-$100 per hour. Using agency interpreters cost the college $264,603 for the 2015-2016 year. Cerritos spent $601,942 on interpreting services during the 2015-2016 year (agency and hourly interpreters). The establishment of this position can assure the level of quality and skill will be consistent when serving our deaf students and we estimate a cost savings for the District. The recommended salary range for this position is from $30.54 to $36.83 per hour.

Public Affairs Specialist. The establishment of this Public Affairs Specialist position is to re-classify the Administrative Secretary I position recently vacated to capture significant changes in duties and responsibilities required of the position. These changes resulted from increased department demands and responsibilities, including administrative and senior-level secretarial support. This position is responsible for assisting with government relations and public affairs matters and will assist with monitoring, researching
and tracking state, local and federal legislation. Other core responsibilities include planning and facilitating social media to increase engagement, and assisting with the development of promotional materials, among other duties as assigned. This position reports to the Director of College Relations, Public Affairs, and Governmental Relations.

CSEA and District met, discussed, and agreed on the establishment and salary placement of these classified job classifications.

NOTICING REQUIREMENTS
None is required beyond posting of this item on the agenda.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Sign Language Interpreter and Public Affairs Specialists job descriptions
Position: Sign Language Interpreter  
Salary Grade: 45

Summary

Under the direction of the Dean of Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), the American Sign Language Interpreter (ASL Interpreter) provides appropriate sign language and/or oral interpretation for students and staff who are deaf, deaf-blind and hard of hearing in the post-secondary educational setting. This position will include lecture and laboratory classes, guidance sessions, tutoring sessions, field trips, and student activities. The ASL Interpreter may be asked to oversee the daily operations of the communication support schedule as well as mentoring.

Distinguishing Career Features

Provide high quality professional American Sign Language interpreting onsite and off campus according to approved District activities. ASL Interpreters must possess fluent American Sign Language and spoken English language skills, accurate interpreting skills, and thorough knowledge of and adherence to the RID Code of Professional Conduct. The ASL Interpreter serve the college community by interpreting educational and general information exchanged in an educational setting. Educates the campus community on Deaf culture, sharing resources and providing superior customer service. Participate in additional projects that lead to the development and progress of the DSPS services and programs.

Essential Duties and Responsibilities

- Provide both sign-to-voice and voice-to-sign interpretation/transliteration, in the students’ preferred language mode, in classrooms and campus related activities.
- Provide both sign-to-voice and voice-to-sign interpretation in preferred staff members language mode.
- Conveys the full meaning of a message using oral, manual, and tactile forms of communication for deaf, deaf-blind and hard of hearing students and staff and voices their message with an oral presentation in proper English syntax.
- Provide educational interpreting for students in a lecture environment and individual instruction. Observe the progress of a student and adapt or modify methods of communication and/or discuss concerns with the instructor and program staff as needed.
- Serve as an interpreter at various campus events including: department meetings, student orientations, professional development activities, counseling appointments, assessment testing, field trips, theatrical productions and other extracurricular activities,
• Consult with faculty to identify potential problems that could inhibit the effective provision of interpreting services including instructional materials or closed captioning requirements.

• Provide assistance to and substitute for the Communication Coordinator as requested, provide assistance with emerging interpreters and conducting interviews/assessments of applicants for hourly interpreter positions; assist with scheduling interpreters and captioners as needed.

• Assist in setting up and conducting meetings, workshops and training sessions.

• Observe, provide feedback to and mentor hourly interpreters as needed.

• Observe and provide feedback regarding captioners as needed.

• Oversee skill development library/materials including: Facilitate materials loan process (books, DVDs, practice tests); Following up on delinquent materials; Maintaining and expanding the library resources; Organizing and updating inventory of materials available

• Respond to in-person and telephone inquiries

• Disseminate information to students, interpreters and faculty

• Oversee maintenance of the interpreter/captioner office

• Ensure confidentiality of all student and interpreter/captioner information

• Assist in development of interpreter and captioner handbooks/materials

• Work cooperatively and collegially as a team member while serving a multicultural population

• May perform a variety of administrative duties related to the effective programs for students who are deaf, deaf-blind or hard of hearing such as accepting voice/video calls, disseminating information, processing correspondence and records, conduct training, and maintain confidential records and documents.

• Attend Departmental functions and meetings as required.

• Perform other duties as assigned.

Qualifications

Knowledge and Skills

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) Code of Professional Conduct. Current Postsecondary/Educational sign language interpreting practices as set forth by Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). Deaf culture, technology, current trends and techniques in the field of interpreting for individuals with hearing loss and from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Excellent interpersonal and communication skills. Basic recordkeeping and administrative procedures. Utilization of computer systems, equipment and software used in providing services to individuals who are deaf, deaf-blind, hard of hearing, or have a cochlear implant.
**Abilities**
Accurately interpret from English to both American Sign Language (ASL) and Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE) and other signed systems. Accurately interpret from both ASL and CASE to spoken English. Convey the thought, intent and spirit of a speaker communicating to students who are deaf, deaf-blind, or hard of hearing. Ability to utilize the preferred sign language vocabulary to ensure proper interpretation for various academic, social and vocational subject matters. Establish and maintain effective relationships with students, faculty and staff. Work independently on a variety of assignments. Communicate effectively both verbally and in writing. Work effectively with college students, faculty and staff from a variety of backgrounds. Work effectively with students with deafness and other disabilities. Ability to platform interpret.

**Physical Abilities**
May require maintaining physical condition necessary for walking, standing or sitting for long periods of time. Dexterity of hands and fingers for clarity in sign language. Visual and auditory acuity to facilitate the interpreting process.

**Education and Experience**
The position requires any combination equivalent to: Graduation from an Interpreter Training Program (ITP) or equivalent or Associate Degree in American Sign Language, Interpreting, or a related field; AND 3 years’ experience interpreting for deaf, deaf-blind and hard of hearing individuals; AND possession of any of the following national certifications: Registry of Interpreters for Deaf (RID), Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) with score of 4.0 or higher; National Interpreter Certification (NIC); Certificate of Interpretation (CI) and Certificate of Transliteration (CT); National Association for the Deaf (NAD).

**Licenses and Certificates**
Require a valid driver’s license.

**Working Conditions**
Work is performed indoors in an office environment, classroom, and laboratory settings. Extensive contact with students who are deaf, deaf-blind and hard of hearing.
Cerritos College Position Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Salary Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Specialist</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Under the direction of the Director, College Relations, Public Affairs, and Governmental Relations, performs specialized administrative support duties, including (but not limited to) administration of office routines and systems, processing of financial transactions, and reception, facilitating Public Affairs processes, transcribing of specialized or technical notes, and composing original documents and reports. Assists with administrative projects and programs that impact and/or involve other organization units and locations.

Distinguishing Career Features

The Public Affairs Specialist provides administrative and senior-level secretarial support. The Public Affairs Specialist requires competencies such as the ability to use independent judgement, discretion, professionalism, and interpretation of policies and procedures, and implement required procedures for Public Affairs. This position requires the ability to accurately coordinate information and prepare formal presentations, special studies and reports for Public Affairs, including government relations and public affairs matters and will assist with monitoring, researching and tracking state, local and federal legislation. The Public Affairs Specialist will plan and facilitate social media to increase engagement, and assist with the development of promotional materials.

Essential Duties and Responsibilities

- Provide support to and may coordinate activities connected with governmental relations and public affairs matters.
- Research state, local, and federal legislation from external resources such as governmental agencies and organize information in a reporting format.
- Maintain social media and monitor social media campaign performance.
- Prepare presentation materials that support public speaking engagements such as overheads, pictures, charts, and graphs.
- Participate in, and may coordinate and/or prepare certain aspects of newsletters and other internal and external publications describing events, activities, and giving feature stories.
- Conduct research of community demographics and educational interests. Work with institutional researchers to identify and understand trends.
• May provide input on design and promotional materials, taking into consideration
  the intended message, audience, and the need to integrate text, graphics, and artwork.
• Take notes and prepare minutes for Web Standards Committee meetings.
• Receive visitors and screen telephone calls, handling routine matters, providing
  information, or routing calls to administrators as necessary.
• Schedule appointments and arrange meetings. Prepare schedules and inform
  participants, confirming dates and times.
• Provide logistics and other support to on and off campus events. Participate in
  communications to event participants.
• Maintain records and assist in the preparation of departmental/divisional reports
  by gathering and summarizing information from a variety of sources.
• Collect and coordinate documents for class schedule and catalog.
• Update the District’s main outdoor digital marquee.
• Assist with development of organizational unit budget proposals by collecting
  information and maintaining communications with work sections on status and
  information needs.
• Maintain approved budgets and transaction records, including those for projects.
  Maintain budget records and prepare, process, and enter payroll, timecard
  information for employees in the organization unit.
• Receive, process, and may reconcile documents for expenditures. Prepare
  requisitions and claims for reimbursement.
• Order merchandise and services from pre-approved purchase orders and within
  authorized spending limits.
• May update and modify website pages using established formats and standards.
• Performs other related duties as assigned.

Qualifications

Knowledge and Skills

Requires strong language and writing skills to prepare professional materials and edit
text to be suitable for communications. Requires sufficient English language skills to
edit technical and policy copy for grammar, syntax, clarity, and content. Requires
well-developed interpersonal skills to interact and share information with a wide
range of contacts on- and off- campus. Requires proofreading and editing skills to
review educational and promotional materials. Requires a working knowledge of
computer-aided office productivity tools including but not limited to, Microsoft
Office, desktop publishing, graphics, and internet and intranet web page editing
programs. Requires working knowledge of modern office practices, procedures and
equipment, including filing systems, telephone techniques, and letter and report
writing. Requires a working knowledge of, and skill at using personal computer
based software programs, including but not limited to word processing, spreadsheet,
and basic presentation graphics. Requires strong knowledge of social media platforms. Requires sufficient math skills to perform budget and record keeping.

- **Abilities**
  Requires the ability to learn, explain, and promote College programs and functions. Requires the ability to identify, organize, and sequence activities that support marketing and communications projects. Requires the ability to work under deadline pressure and handle simultaneous projects. Requires the ability to access website pages to edit and update materials. Requires the ability to troubleshoot problems associated with production of graphics and web page images. Requires the ability to compose written copy from instruction, concept, or hand copy and convert to formats suitable for external distribution. Requires the ability to work cooperatively and productively with diverse populations.

- **Physical Abilities**
  The position incumbent must be able to function indoors in an office environment engaged in work of primarily a sedentary nature. Requires ambulatory ability to sit for extended periods of time, to utilize microcomputers and peripheral equipment, accomplish other desktop work, and to move to various campus locations. Requires the ability to use near vision to read printed materials. Requires auditory ability to carry on conversations in person and over the phone. Requires the ability to retrieve work materials from overhead, waist, and ground level files. Requires manual and finger dexterity to write, use a pointing device and keyboard at an advanced rate, operate microcomputer, and to operate other standardized office equipment, almost constantly requiring repetitive motions.

- **Education and Experience**
  The position requires a Bachelor’s degree in English, public relations, marketing communications or related field. Two years of experience in public relations, marketing, public affairs or communications. Additional relevant experience combined with an Associate’s degree may substitute for some higher education. Preferred experience in government relations, working for an elected official and/or related work.

- **Licenses and Certificates**
  May require a valid driver’s license.

**Working Conditions**

Work is performed indoors where minimal safety considerations exist.
FROM:  
Dr. Jose Fierro  
President/Superintendent

SUBJECT:  Consideration of Approval of Board Resolution No. 16-0817A Accepting the Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee Regarding the Complaints of Trustees Arthur and Drayer and Resolving to Reprimand Trustee Drayer for Violating Board Policy 2715.9.C. And 2715.10

ACTION  
It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve Board Resolution No. 16-0817A Accepting the Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee Regarding the Complaints of Trustees Arthur and Drayer and Resolving to Reprimand Trustee Drayer for Violating Board Policy 2715.9.C. And 2715.10.

FISCAL IMPACT  
No fiscal impact.

REPORT SUMMARY  
Based on the attached findings of fact and analysis the majority of the ad hoc committee, by a 2-1 vote, concluded that Trustee Arthur’s complaint was sustained based on the facts, while Trustee Drayer’s complaint was not sustained by the facts. As requested by the ad hoc committee the investigator provided the committee with recommendations on how to proceed. Board Policy 2715 references several forms of discipline for Board members including censure, reprimand, possible exclusion from closed sessions, referral to the District Attorney for criminal prosecution, “or other action as determined by the Board.” It was the investigator’s recommendation that the ad hoc committee recommend to the Board that Trustee Drayer be reprimanded for his conduct alleged in the complaint of Trustee Arthur. The ad hoc committee accepted the recommendation of its investigator, and now recommends that Trustee Drayer be reprimanded for his conduct as alleged in the complaint of Trustee Arthur.

NOTICING REQUIREMENTS  
None is required beyond posting of this item on the agenda.

ATTACHMENT(S)  
Board Resolution No. 16-0817A
BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 16-0817A

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE REGARDING THE COMPLAINTS OF TRUSTEES ARTHUR AND DRAZER AND RESOLVING TO REPRIMAND TRUSTEE DRAZER FOR VIOLATING BOARD POLICY 2715.9.c. AND 2715.10

WHEREAS, Board Policy 2715.9.c and Board Policy 2715.10 provide in pertinent part as follows:

Each Member of the Board of Trustees of Cerritos Community College District will:

9. Promote a healthy working relationship with the President/Superintendent and his or her staff by:

   * ... *

c. Sharing all concerns, complaints and recommendations, as appropriate, with other Board members and the President/ Superintendent, as the Brown Act allows.

10. Recognize that contacts with the media are primarily handled by the Superintendent/President and/or Board President.

WHEREAS, Trustee Arthur gave to the Board President only a complaint against Trustee Drayer on March 2, 2016 alleging that Trustee Drayer had violated Board Policy (sometimes referred to as “BP”) 2715.9.c and 2715.10.

WHEREAS, Trustee Arthur’s complaint provides in pertinent part as follows:

Dear Dr. Liu:

On Wednesday, February 17, 2016 I submitted my travel receipts to Ms. Wittig for expenditures incurred while attending the 2016 ACCT Conference in Washington DC. Included with the receipts was a spreadsheet I developed detailing all expenses as well as an American Express Credit Card belonging to the college issued in my name. At the time Ms. Wittig was at her desk and Trustee Drayer was at her work station. There was no communication that I recall between Trustee Drayer and myself.

On Friday evening, February 19, I received a text request from Dr. Fierro asking me to give him a call at my convenience. He and I spoke later that evening. He informed me that a request for information had been received from Hews Media regarding my travel expenditures and the use of the American Express Credit Card.

Board Policy 2715 reads in part that we should promote a healthy working relationship ... sharing all concerns, complaints and recommendations, as appropriate, with other Board members and the President/Superintendent ... and recognize that contacts with the media are primarily handled by the President/Superintendent and/or the Board President.

In addition, in a recent communication from the President of the CCFF regarding the negotiations between the college and the union he mentions, in part, college “credit cards” in part of his statements for his union’s position.
It is my belief that Mr. Drayer has violated our Board Policy 2715 and request that the Board President appoint an ad hoc committee to conduct an investigation and review this matter. (Emphasis added.)

WHEREAS, later that same evening Trustee Drayer gave to the Board President only a complaint which provided as follows:

I request an ad hoc committee be set up to review the ethics of the bullying of Board member Bob Arthur to other Board members.

WHEREAS, this first complaint by Trustee Drayer provided no facts relating to what specific conduct supported the allegation of “bullying” by Trustee Arthur, and made no reference to which provision(s) of Board Policy 2715, Trustee Drayer believed were violated by Trustee Arthur. The investigator subsequently assumed that Board Policy 2715.2, which addresses conduct that may be considered “bullying,” applied to Trustee Drayer’s complaint. Board Policy 2715.2 provides as follows:

Each Member of the Board of Trustees of Cerritos Community College District will:

2. Establish a climate of mutual respect and trust even though legitimate differences of opinion may exist among Board Members.

WHEREAS, at the March 2, 2016 meeting, Trustee Drayer gave the Board President a second document:

I ask that an ad hoc committee be formed to create harmony, trust & team building of board members interpersonal communications.

WHEREAS, while this document purports to be a complaint, it does not contain any reference to factual allegations of a violation of Board Policy 2715, and was more in the nature of a request which the Board as a whole could take up as it sees fit.

WHEREAS, Board Policy 2715.15 provides procedures for the Board to enforce the provisions of Board Policy 2715.1 through 2715.14, as required by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Standard IV. With respect to enforcement, Board Policy 2715.15 provides as follows:

15. ENFORCEMENT

a. The majority of the Board reserves the right to censure any Board member who does not adhere to the confidentiality of closed sessions or engages in any unethical conduct.

b. Censure is an official expression of disapproval passed by the Board of Trustees. A Board member may be subject to a resolution of censure by the Board of Trustees should it be determined the Trustee misconduct has occurred.

c. A complaint of Trustee misconduct will be referred to the Board President. The Board President will appoint an ad hoc committee of three Trustees not associated with the complaint to conduct an investigation and review of the matter. In the event the complaint involves the Board President, another officer of the Board shall form the ad hoc committee. A thorough fact finding process, formulated in a manner deemed appropriate by the committee, shall be initiated. The committee shall be guided in its inquiry by the standards set forth in this policy and shall complete their inquiries within a reasonable period of time.
WHEREAS, President Liu established an ad hoc committee pursuant to Board Policy 2715.15 to inquire into the two complaints presented to her. The ad hoc committee held its first meeting on March 7, 2016, and directed that legal counsel investigate this matter and report back to the committee with his findings and recommendations. Neither Trustee Drayer, nor Trustee Arthur received a copy of the other’s complaint(s) in advance of their interviews by counsel. Trustee Drayer dismissed his complaints against Trustee Arthur, many of the same allegations were repeated to the committee at its meeting with Trustee Drayer on August 9, 2016.

WHEREAS, the following paragraphs summarize the findings of the investigator reported to the ad hoc committee prior to August 9, 2016.

A. Trustee Drayer’s Complaint - April 14, 2016, Telephonic Interview of Trustee Drayer

1. Shortly after the ad hoc Committee’s initial meeting, the Superintendent/President, Dr. Fierro, informed the investigator that Trustee Drayer did not want to meet with the investigator out of a concern that the investigator was biased against him. Trustee Drayer’s concern was based on his perception that the investigator was present at the meeting where Trustee Arthur’s complaint against Trustee Drayer was received by the Board President. As a result, for several weeks, no progress was made with respect to this investigation.

2. On April 14, 2016 at approximately 3:30 p.m., Trustee Drayer called the investigator, and the investigator and Trustee Drayer spoke for just under an hour. At first the investigator asked if they could set up a meeting so that he could conduct the interview in person. Trustee Drayer said he would be unable to meet, because all of the stress the District and Board members are causing him has resulted in him having pink eye. However, Trustee Drayer proceeded to give the investigator a “preview” of what he would tell the investigator if they were to meet in person.

3. Trustee Drayer told the investigator that he is “convinced” that the Board, and particularly Trustee Arthur, is “out to get him.” Trustee Drayer told the investigator that he believes that Trustee Arthur dislikes and is opposed to Trustee Drayer because Trustee Arthur and other Board members are “homophobic republicans.” Trustee Drayer believes he is being discriminated against because of his sexual orientation among other protected characteristics. He believes the Board and Dr. Fierro are intent on frustrating his ability to receive public records or provide information that will embarrass Trustee Arthur and other Board members. Trustee Drayer believes that the Board is intent on violating his First Amendment rights, and that Dr. Liu and the investigator “tainted the jury pool” when the committee was formed to consider Trustee Arthur’s complaint against Trustee Drayer, and Trustee Drayer’s complaints against Trustee Arthur.

4. Trustee Drayer claims that Trustee Arthur intends to, and has engaged in harassing and threatening behavior. More specifically, according to Trustee Drayer this assertion arises, at least in part, from a trip that Trustees Zurich, Liu and Drayer took to visit Southwestern College in San Diego County. The purpose of the trip was to gather additional information on one of the finalists for the then current presidential vacancy. Apparently, former President Lacy had arranged a District van and driver to take the Board members down to the College, but instead Trustee Arthur drove the group. According to Trustee Drayer, he felt “coerced” into going with Trustee Arthur and the other trustees. The other trustees did not have a problem with the change or Trustee Arthur’s driving, “because they are politically aligned,” according to Trustee Drayer. Trustee Arthur allegedly did things that terrified and stressed Trustee Drayer, including driving very fast, and refusing to stop to allow Trustee Drayer to use the restroom or get something to eat, despite Trustee Arthur
knowing that Trustee Drayer suffered from several ailments that would necessitate stops and eating. Trustee Drayer stated that Trustee Arthur was intent on “psychologically torturing me.” Trustee Drayer stated that Trustee Arthur had a “time certain to be back in the area.”

5. Trustee Drayer asserted during the interview that credit card records from 2003-2011 had been destroyed. He stated that the credit cards are an “outrage” and that he has checked with other entities and they do not allow their elected officials to have credit cards.

6. At different points in the interview Trustee Drayer made reference to desiring that a neutral mutually agreeable third party be brought in to facilitate a discussion between Trustee Arthur and Trustee Drayer. Trustee Drayer suggested Dr. Eddie Hernandez be utilized to facilitate the discussion; Dr. Hernandez had headed the search to fill the current President’s position. Trustee Drayer also felt that a facilitated meeting among all of the Board members would be useful. These comments are consistent with Trustee Drayer’s request in his second “complaint” received by the Board President on March 2, 2016.

7. Trustee Drayer then returned to his theme of asserting how much personal damage Trustee Arthur, the Board, and Dr. Fierro have caused him. Trustee Drayer claims that as a result of his service on the Board he has been diagnosed with “Post Traumatic Stress Disorder” and “anxiety.” He further claims that he has sought accommodation from the District’s Human Resources office. The investigator did ask Trustee Drayer why he thought Human Resources would be able to assist a Board member with accommodations since he was not an employee. Trustee Drayer responded that for some purposes he was an employee, or “like an employee.” The investigator did not challenge these assertions.

8. Trustee Drayer expressed his belief that he “feels that Trustee Arthur wants to kill” him. He then returned to another theme: “I’m a vocal gay wealthy person.” Trustee Drayer stated that he wants the Board to be open minded about him and his efforts at transparency.

9. The foregoing reflects a partial summary of the interview with Trustee Drayer; however, all aspects of Trustee Drayer’s specific “bullying” allegation are included herein.

B. April 26, 2016 Interview of Trustee Arthur

1. Since the investigator was only able to conduct his interview of Trustee Drayer by telephone, he concluded that he would conduct his interview of Trustee Arthur by telephone as well. On April 26, 2016, at approximately 4:00 p.m., the investigator spoke with Trustee Arthur for about thirty-five minutes. The first portion of the conversation focused on Trustee Arthur’s complaint against Trustee Drayer. Trustee Arthur confirmed the factual statements in his complaint.

2. Trustee Arthur stated that as a result of a Board discussion at a meeting sometime in 2008, it was determined that credit cards would be provided to trustees, but not kept by them; the cards could be “check-out” from the Executive Assistant in the President’s office when travelling on District business, but had to be returned to Ms. Wittig at the end of the business trip. Trustee Arthur was not aware of whether the District’s or Board’s practice with respect to the issuance of credit cards has changed.

3. In speaking with the Superintendent/President, Dr. Jose L. Fierro, Board President, Dr. Shin Lui, and Trustee Bob Arthur, the investigator learned that in public session on March 2, 2016, Trustee Drayer admitted having engaged in the conduct alleged in Trustee Arthur’s complaint.
4. Based on Trustee Drayer’s admission, the investigator concluded as a matter of fact, that upon observing Trustee Arthur turning in his expense reimbursement request for his trip to the Association of Community College Trustees meeting in Washington D.C., and his District issued credit card, to Andrea Wittig, Executive Assistant to the President, on Wednesday, February 17, 2016, Trustee Drayer, shortly thereafter took his suspicions to the media and the faculty association rather than asking Trustee Arthur, or President Fierro about the credit card.

5. In light of Trustee Drayer’s admission of the allegation in Trustee Arthur’s complaint, the main purpose of interviewing Trustee Arthur was to obtain his version of the facts with respect to Trustee Drayer’s complaint, after learning the specifics of that complaint from Trustee Drayer.

6. When the investigator asked Trustee Arthur what he thought Trustee Drayer should have done, Trustee Arthur responded that Trustee Drayer should have gone to Dr. Fierro or the Board President and asked that there be an agenda item regarding use of District issued credit cards by Trustees. Trustee Arthur also stated that Trustee Drayer could have also come to him directly.

7. Trustee Arthur had not seen or heard the content of Trustee Drayer’s “bullying” complaint, and was not aware that it had been given to Board President Liu on March 2, 2016.

8. When asked to describe his relationship with Trustee Drayer, Trustee Arthur responded that they are “on the Board together, other than that they have no relationship.” Trustee Arthur denied disliking Trustee Drayer. Trustee Arthur recognized that they have differences of opinion at the Board table, otherwise their relationship is civil. Trustee Arthur had no understanding of what Trustee Drayer was referring to in his allegation that Trustee Arthur “bullied” Trustee Drayer. Trustee Arthur did not know that Trustee Drayer believed that he and other Board members oppose and dislike Trustee Drayer because they are “homophobic Republicans.”

9. With respect to the visit to Southwestern College, Trustee Arthur denied knowing that a van had been arranged for the trip, but stated that he would have driven his car alone because it would be more comfortable and he needed to return on time for a family event that evening. Trustee Arthur denies having done anything that would have “coerced” Trustee Drayer into going in his car. Trustee Arthur does not recall any of the trustees complaining about his driving or the speed at which he was driving. Trustee Arthur was not aware that Trustee Drayer felt “terrified and stressed” by Trustee Arthur’s driving. Trustee Arthur recalls that he was not willing to stay longer at Southwestern for dinner because he needed to get home for the family event. When the interviews were over Trustee Arthur did state that it was time to go and that he needed to drive straight home. Consistent with Trustee Drayer’s statement, Trustee Arthur agreed that he did have “a time certain” by which he needed to be back in the Cerritos area.

10. Trustee Arthur stated that he was not aware of Trustee Drayer’s desire that a neutral mutually agreeable third party be brought in to facilitate a discussion between Trustee Drayer and Trustee Arthur. Further Trustee Arthur was unaware of Trustee Drayer’s desire that there be a “facilitated” meeting among all Board members. Trustee Arthur did not think such meetings would be useful. Trustee Arthur stated that in the last three and one-half years they have had several such meetings and they have not proven to be useful.

C. Trustee Drayer’s Meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee on August 9, 2016
1. The ad hoc committee scheduled a meeting with Trustee Drayer and Trustees Liu and Lewis in order to afford Trustee Drayer a further opportunity to present information to the committee pursuant to Board Policy 2715.15.d. Trustee Salazar was unable to attend the meeting.

2. Trustee Drayer began by reasserting his allegation that when Trustee Arthur gave his complaint to Board President Liu, and she in turn formed the ad hoc committee and asked questions of Trustee Drayer, that this amounted to a violation of the Brown Act.

3. Trustee Drayer also complained that as a matter of due process he should have received a copy of Trustee Arthur’s complaint at the beginning of the process, not knowing that neither Trustee had received a copy of the other trustee’s complaint(s).

4. Trustee Drayer complained of inadequate or “inappropriate” training with respect to Board Policy 2715 on which the pending complaint is premised.

5. As he had in his telephone interview with the investigator, Trustee Drayer throughout the meeting asserted that he was only “exercising his right to request and receive public records.” This statement was being made in the context of receiving records relating to Trustee Arthur’s use of a District credit card for District travel, although it was not entirely clear from Trustee Drayer’s comments whether he was referring to additional records. Trustee Drayer did admit that he promptly receive the credit card records from the President’s office. Mr. Drayer asserted that it was okay to request public records. He stated he was told that he needed to come to the office to review the credit card records. Mr. Drayer asserted more globally that he had been denied public information by the District. It was not clear whether this accusation was aimed at the current administration or the prior President, Dr. Lacey.

6. Trustee Drayer admitted that he may have “jumped too excitedly – jumped the gun” in reference to going to the press.

7. Trustee Drayer restated his belief that there was no mutual respect among Board members, or at least not between other Board members and him. Trustee Drayer stated that he repeatedly has suggested that the Board engage in some form of “team-building or mediation.” He repeated that he thought that Dr. Hernandez would be a good person to do the mediation.

8. Trustee Drayer asserted that the Board has caused him to have “panic attacks” and that he “feels tortured” by his colleagues on the Board. He feels that he has made good faith efforts to resolve his conflicts with Board member, but that Board members do not have the right to “intimidate him in board meetings.” It was not clear what Trustee Drayer was referring to by this statement. He claims that he is “trying to move on.”

9. Trustee Drayer stated that “prejudicial statements” were made against him and that Board members threatened him. Trustee Drayer repeatedly accused the investigator of being biased against him. Trustee Drayer stated that when he attended the training for new trustees there was discussion of the “black sheep board member,” and that Trustee Shin Liu made a similar statement about Trustee Drayer.

10. Trustee Drayer stated that his 75,000 constituents “want me to inform them about what’s going on in the District.” Trustee Drayer stated that he has “no malice” against any of his colleagues on the Board. Trustee Drayer asserted that this complaint process is not productive and that he “wants to make more changes because things are so wrong.” There is a “kill the messenger” mentality on the Board.
11. Trustee Drayer stated that it was not Trustee Arthur’s fault that he had the credit card. Trustee Drayer faulted Dr. Lacy for hiding things from the Board. Trustee Drayer stated that he came from a dysfunctional alcoholic family where family members hid themselves and other things from each other. Trustee Drayer asked rhetorically, “How can we build trust?

12. Trustee Drayer asserted that there was a “gender pattern” in Board officer position selection and this was a form of discrimination against Mr. Drayer as a gay man. Trustee Drayer asserted that the Board had “not had proper training to deal with an openly gay person – I’m out of the box.”

13. Being on the Board has been an “emotionally intense ride” for Trustee Drayer over the last four years. He repeated that he was “sorry if I jumped the gun – we’re all in the wrong.” Trustee Drayer stated that he felt “misunderstood” and as a result he “overreacted.”

14. At this point in the meeting Trustee Zurich Lewis confronted Trustee Drayer by asking “you admit to going to Hews media first?” Trustee Drayer did not answer this question directly. Trustee Drayer instead responded by saying that he went on his own behalf and on behalf of his constituents – “he didn’t mean to embarrass Bob Arthur.” Trustee Shin Lui asked, wouldn’t it have been better to ask Bob Arthur what was going on?” Trustee Drayer responded that he and Mr. Arthur don’t get along – he does not feel safe around Mr. Arthur – and Mr. Arthur won’t respond to his calls. Trustee Drayer clarified that he was afraid Mr. Arthur would physically harm him.

15. Trustee Drayer asserted, as in his April 14th telephone interview, that he was suffering “post-traumatic stress disorder” as a result of the Board’s conduct. Trustee Drayer stated that he has been under much stress with his father’s passing two years ago and having to run his family’s six businesses, teach and serve on the Board.

16. Trustee Drayer stated that with respect to the trip to Southwestern College Trustees Liu and Lewis were fair to him and recognized his need to eat and use the restroom.

17. Trustee Drayer became upset and in tears, and walked out of the meeting just after 7:00 p.m. Trustee Lewis left at approximately 7:15. Trustee Drayer returned at about 7:25.

18. Trustee Drayer requested and received a copy of Trustee Arthur’s complaint. He reviewed the complaint and made a number of comments, including that before going to the press he had asked other trustees, perhaps Avalos and Perez whether they had District credit cards and they indicated that they did not have credit cards. Trustee Liu pointed out that Mr. Drayer had also asked her, but that was after he went to the press.

19. Trustee Liu tried, unsuccessfully, to get Trustee Drayer to understand the impact of his conduct on his colleagues and the functioning of the Board. It became apparent that nothing positive could occur as a result of further discussion on this occasion.

20. On August 9, 2016, Trustee Drayer prepared correspondence to the ad hoc committee attempting to refute the allegations made by Trustee Arthur, excuse his own conduct, and make recommendations for how the Board should proceed in the future.

D. Investigator’s Analysis and Findings of Fact

1. Based on Trustee Drayer’s admissions, the investigator concluded as a matter of fact, that upon observing Trustee Arthur turning in his expense reimbursement request for his trip to the Association of Community College Trustees meeting in Washington D.C., and his District issued credit card, to Andrea Wittig, Executive Assistant to the President, on
Wednesday, February 17, 2016, Trustee Drayer, shortly thereafter took his suspicions to
the media and the faculty association rather than asking Trustee Arthur, or President
Fierro about the credit card, in an effort to embarrass Trustee Arthur and perhaps the
entire Board. Trustee Drayer’s assertion at the August 9, 2016 committee meeting that
he had asked Trustees Perez and Avalos whether they had credit was not mentioned in
Trustee Drayer’s initial interview. Further, Trustee Drayer has presented no statement
with respect to the context provided to these trustees for his inquiry; he has not stated
whether he informed them of the reason for his inquiry. If Trustee Drayer had made such
an inquiry it is reasonable to expect that he would have so stated at the outset of his
involvement in the investigation, rather than first admitting the allegations in Trustee
Arthur’s complaint, and only bringing this assertion to the committee’s attention several
months later.

2. The investigator found that Trustee Drayer’s conduct was contrary to Board Policies
2715.9.c, and 2715.10. Board Policy 2715.9.c. commits members of the Board of
Trustees to “sharing all concerns, complaints and recommendations, as appropriate, with
other Board members and the President/Superintendent.” Board Policy 2715.10 provides
that “contacts with the media are primarily handled by the Superintendent/President and/or
Board President.” The Board Policy does not prevent Board members from going to the
press, but does seek Board member compliance with the ACCJC’s Governance
Standards.

3. The investigator concluded that Trustee Drayer’s allegation of “bullying” by Trustee Arthur,
or any other members of the Board, was not supported by the evidence. It was also
concluded that Trustee Arthur did not “bully” or “torment” Trustee Drayer. Trustee Drayer’s
claim that he felt coerced into going in Trustee Arthur’s car on the trip to Southwestern
College was found to be not credible. Trustee Drayer’s alleged feelings of “terror,” “stress,”
and “psychological torment” were just that, his own unexpressed feelings. Trustee Drayer
was free to ride in the District van, which he states was arranged by President Lacy, or to
drive himself. No evidence was found to support a conclusion that Trustee Drayer had in
any way relinquished his free will. It is further concluded that Trustee Arthur wanted to
drive himself because of his desire for comfort and his need to get back in time for a family
event, and not to trap or harm Trustee Drayer in any respect.

4. To the extent it was necessary to assess the credibility of Trustees Drayer and Arthur, it
was found that Trustee Arthur was the more credible of the two gentlemen. This
conclusion is based on a number of factors and observations:

First, Trustee Drayer’s non-specific complaint against Trustee Arthur was not
presented until after Trustee Arthur had presented his complaint to the Board
President, thereby giving rise to the inference that Trustee Drayer’s complaint was
simply a late and impromptu response to Trustee Arthur’s factually specific
complaint made earlier in the evening; Trustee Drayer admitted to Trustee Arthur’s
allegations in public that evening.

Second, Trustee Drayer’s complaint lacked details, and was found to be related to
events that had occurred many months prior to the making of the complaint.

Third, for several weeks Trustee Drayer refused to participate in the Board’s
process for handling Trustee complaints by refusing to meet with the ad hoc
Committee’s investigator.

Fourth, while Trustee Drayer may have indeed experienced the emotions he
asserted in his interview, and his appearance before the committee, he did nothing
to make his fears or emotions known at that time he was experiencing them.
Trustee Drayer’s belief that none of his colleagues would have stood up to Trustee Arthur because they are “politically aligned” is not credible. If, for example, Trustee Arthur was driving too fast on the trip to or from Southwestern College, raising this concern would not have been illogical, and would have provided Trustee Drayer with objective information regarding his feelings of “terror.”

Fifth, while it is entirely possible that despite his denials, Trustee Arthur dislikes Trustee Drayer, it is not credible to assert that Trustee Arthur, or other members of the Board, are the source of Trustee Drayer’s claimed emotional distress, or alleged “post-traumatic stress disorder.” Trustee Drayer’s assertion of “post-traumatic stress disorder” is not credible, because no facts were presented by Trustee Drayer that any Board member had or could cause Trustee Drayer to suffer any of the events constituting a “trauma” for purposes of a diagnosis of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder.

5. Trustee Drayer’s assertion of a Brown Act violation is without merit. The Board President’s acceptance of Trustee Arthur’s complaint against Trustee Drayer and the formation of a three member advisory committee to investigate the allegations in Trustee Arthur’s complaint during the March 2, 2016 closed session meeting did not violate the Brown Act’s requirements with respect to closed session discussions, or the Act’s notice and agenda requirements. Board Policy 2715 directs that complaints brought under Board Policy 2715 be made to the Board President, and delegates unilateral authority to the Board President to appoint a less than a quorum advisory committee composed solely of Board members to investigate the allegations and report back to the entire Board on their findings and recommendations in public. Government Code section 54952.2(b). However, since only the Board President is authorized to receive ethics complaints and to appoint the ad hoc committee, these steps can be accomplished anywhere at any time, in public or private outside of a Board meeting, in a closed session or in a public session. In this capacity the Board President serves as a single member “decision making body,” who is not subject to the Brown Act. See, Golightly v. Molina, (2014) 229 Cal.App.4th 1501. Finally, no action was taken by the Board with respect to the Board President’s receipt of the complaints.

WHEREAS, based on the foregoing findings of fact and analysis the ad hoc committee has concluded that Trustee Arthur’s complaint was sustained based on the facts, while Trustee Drayer’s complaint(s) was not sustained by the facts.

WHEREAS, as requested by the ad hoc committee the investigator provided the committee with recommendations on how to proceed.

WHEREAS, Board Policy 2715 references several forms of discipline for Board members including censure, reprimand, possible exclusion from closed sessions, referral to the District Attorney for criminal prosecution, “or other action as determined by the Board.” It was the investigator’s recommendation that the ad hoc committee recommend to the Board that Trustee Drayer be reprimanded for his conduct alleged in the complaint of Trustee Arthur.

WHEREAS, the ad hoc committee accepted the recommendation of its investigator, and now recommends that Trustee Drayer be reprimanded for his conduct as alleged in the complaint of Trustee Arthur.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Board hereby accepts the findings of the ad hoc committee based on the report to the committee of the investigator, and so find those facts and conclusions to be true and correct.

---

1 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5).
1. The Board hereby accepts the recommendation of the ad hoc committee that Trustee Drayer be reprimanded for engaging in the conduct set forth in Trustee Arthur’s complaint.

2. Trustee Drayer is hereby reprimanded as follows:

This Board’s Policy 2715 was adopted pursuant to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges’ Accreditation Standard IV.C.11 which provides in part as follows:

The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary.

Board Policy 2715.9.c and Board Policy 2715.10 provide in pertinent part as follows:

Each Member of the Board of Trustees of Cerritos Community College District will:

9. Promote a healthy working relationship with the President/Superintendent and his or her staff by:

   c. Sharing all concerns, complaints and recommendations, as appropriate, with other Board members and the President/ Superintendent, as the Brown Act allows.

10. Recognize that contacts with the media are primarily handled by the Superintendent/President and/or Board President.

By engaging in the conduct alleged in Trustee Arthur’s complaint of March 2, 2016, you have not only violated this Board’s Policy on Ethics, but also jeopardized the College’s standing with its accrediting agency which in turn carries the consequence of impairing our students’ educational opportunities. You must cease from engaging in any further violations of this Board’s Policies. Any future violations of this Board’s Policy will result in additional disciplinary action by this Board.

APPROVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Trustees of the Cerritos Community College District on this 17th day of August, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

President of the Board of Trustees of the Cerritos Community College District

Attested to:

Clerk of the Board of Trustees of the Cerritos Community College District