

Board of Trustees Meeting

June 21, 2018

Transcription of Meeting

31:40

Denise Allen, presenting as the District Assembly President, begins her comments on the work District Assembly (DA) completed during the last year on AB 2410. The revised document was approved by District Assembly as well as by both Academic Senates. Denise urges the board to approve the revised versions of the AP, since that version had been unanimously approved by the faculty, staff and management who serve on District Assembly. Denise explains that the AP was originally pulled because it had not been vetted by the impacted bodies as is required by the collegial consultation process.

Valley AS President also encourages the Board of Trustees to NOT pass the unvetted version of AP 2410, but rather approve the one that had gone through the appropriate process of collegial consultation. She speaks of the dangers of passing a policy that attempts to undermine the 10+1.

Crafton AS President agrees.

50:12

Acting President, Gloria Harrison, calls for the motion to for first reading of AP 2410.

50:30

Donna Ferracone: the reason that we put both versions in the board book, was because we wanted people to have a clear vision of what went through collegial consultation following the board's submission back to you for consultation. So that they could see the recommended changes. The first two pages that you see, we felt, the best way to put in context what the board sees as the version they would like, they discussed at their board retreat and came up with. Now, I will say that, um, BP 2410, simply went back to the way it was presented to DA and AP 2410, we rearranged a sequence and made a couple of minor changes but otherwise it is essentially what went out for review by DA. And, um, so at the board retreat, and there certainly are open for discussion after hearing all of your comments tonight, umm it was decided that the version of BP and AP 2410 that the board originally submitted was what we would like to see go into effect. So, in the sake of discussion, I'll move um Acceptance of BP 2410 on page 412 and AP 2410 on page 413. I'll move approval of those two versions.

Trustee Harrison: Do I have a second?

Trustee Bob Singer: second.

Gloria Harrison: any discussion? I forgot the student trustees. Any discussion? None
OK

Trustee Longville: I just wanna, the uh, I'm somewhat, kind of flustered a bit, by the presentations we've had tonight because...Is that...Well let me first ask, if I could ask of the Chancellor, is there some other entity, other than the, the uh, other than the, uh various folks who have been speaking to us. Is there some other group or entity that we have presented this to for advice that we are relying on instead of our Academic Senates and District Assembly?

Chancellor Baron: We, well let me answer it this way, the Academic Senates are really just one of the collegial consultation groups that reviewed and recommended the version that you, uh, see here. And the Academic Senate just happened to be the ones here tonight to speak to it. But it was classified senate, student senate and to some extent, CSEA, CTA, every constituent group had input to the version that was from the district assembly. I'm going to make a recommendation to you, you don't have to take it, but I think it is always better to work together and try to come out with a collegial AP. And BP 2410 that will maintain the hard work that was done on our last accreditation which very, very strongly said that the board does not respect or work together with shared governance. And even though this might not be the direction that we feel is best, based on the discussion we had at the retreat, I'm telling you it's best based on working day to day with our colleagues, that we want to bring back something that everybody can approve, everybody can live with and can move us forward in our relationship building and our collegial consultation.

Trustee Harrison: Any other discussion?

Trustee Viricel: I agree that we need to work together. I am very put off by what I interpreted, and it's just my interpretation, as threats. That if we don't capitulate to the original, or to the Academic Senates' version that they will be less inclined to work on behalf of students. That they'll be more, um, they'll be less inclined to work on behalf of students. That's really upsetting to me, and I, I'm just not sure how to say this because I'm usually not upset at these meetings. But, that's the thing that becomes the problem here. Is the Do it our way or we're not going to work with you. And we are being asked to do it your way and you're not hearing that there's a desire on behalf of the BOT to also work on behalf of the students. So, I would like to have a version of this that is mutually beneficial but I wonder if, no matter what we talk about, the board will not have the power that other boards, as our research indicates, has. And that's concerning to me 'cause things take an awful long time to get done. So, I don't know. That's my thoughts.

Trustee Harrison: Trustee Ferracone

Trustee Ferracone: I mean, actually, to me, what happened when we sent this BP and AP forward, is that, um, what we asked for was totally rewritten by the Senates back to what the original AP was. And there really wasn't, um, to me, an idea that they were trying to do anything that we were trying to do. So, I kinda felt like all the work the committee did to send it forward was just undone. That's my own personal feeling. So, and to me, the changes, I mean the differences are simply in matters of time and whether we allow the chancellor the ability to make a decision about whether something's academic and professional or not in the submission of proposed policy to the DA or to the Senates directly. And there's a built in, as always the Senate has the opportunity to challenge that and we as a board have to answer that challenge. But, there's also, I think, a feeling that in the Chapter 2 policies, outside of the one on collegial consultation, because that is clearly a, needs to go through the DA and the whole collegial process, we're simply asking that we can make up our own mind on these policies that only can, can have to do with the board. It's not students, it's not faculty, it's not staff, it's strictly board. And make some decisions about those and submit them for information only. So, I'm kind of conflicted. I, you know me well enough to know, I don't want to fight with the academic senate. I don't think that's what this board is trying to do. And I would be sorry if that's the way that the, um, if that's the way the Senates looked at this.

Trustee Harrison: Dr. Singer

Trustee Singer: As a faculty member, dean, administrator, president, now a board member I've been a part of the CA Community College system for many a year. And I can recall, years ago, when faculty had little or no power. And I was very happy when AB 1725 was passed many a year ago which put into statute powers for the faculty senate. I believed in it then, I believe in it now. I believe in collegial consultation. As an aside, maybe not an aside, I don't believe in shared governance. That's not a part of the law. The shared, the governance should be in the hands of the board which is an elected by the electorate. But I do believe in AB 1725. I believe in the 10+1 policy which provides power to the Academic Senate. And I believe in faculty consultation. On the other hand, I think that as a board, we have an obligation to promulgate those policies which keep the basic governance structure within the board. And so therefore, I am in favor of the first part.

Trustee Harrison: Ok. John

Trustee Longville: I would just have to note, I guess, that the comments that have been made tonight probably, if anything, push me further toward voting for the version that was, that was spoken against tonight, because as Trustee Ferracone just reminded us, the fact is that this was submitted for collegial consultation and the problem that the speakers have is that they're perceiving that we're not necessarily going to agree with their advice. Not that we didn't seek the advice, not that we didn't give them an

opportunity to present their advice and sit here and listen to it, but rather that we are not given them the final decision. And that in point of fact, when we have engaged in collegial consultation, this body has overwhelmingly followed the advice of Academic Senates on subject matters covered under the 10+1 or that we acted, we've tended to be more liberal in our interpretation of what we've taken input on and where we've followed advice. And I think, in fact, there's a little bit of a dream world environment out there where folks think that it's not just a matter of that we depend on their advice as a factor in, as the primary factor, a primary factor of advice that we are taking in here, but that we have to agree, absolutely agree. It's kind of like, you know, in 1984, holding up the fingers for Winston, you know. You have to not just tell me you see four you have to believe you see four. And I'm, I'm kinda at the limit of that. I think it's a perception on the part of members of, some members not all, I stress, but some members of the Academic Senate have the, have the perception that in point of fact they should be making the, all the final decisions and, uh. And there's over 92,000 voters in this district who originally elected me to represent them on this board. And somehow, our Academic Senate members have the idea that that representation is outweighed by their perceptions and I'm afraid I'm not able to go along with it. So I'm fully in support of the motion before us.

Turste Harrison: Any other discussion? Frank

Trusee Reyes: I was a faculty member for many years. I was a faculty senate. We always took everything very seriously in terms of whether it be the students or curriculum or so forth. You know, and I, when I was a faculty member and then I became an administrator, and they always pointed the finger, we've said it before that they're coming after us. And if you really sit down and talk to one another, you find out that we are all trying to do what is best for the student. And I would have to agree with what John and Donna's saying that the faculty senate think they're, they're running the show and they're not. We were elected for responsibility to make sure that the students get the best. Now, I'll say this, faculty senate members don't live in the community sometimes. They don't know what our students are asking me or each of the board members in terms of what is important. And so, having come from a faculty member, having a total respect, now being on the other side as a board of trustee, I would say that we are trying to work together but when you come up here and you try to be as forceful to us, as the faculty senate is trying to do, that's not working together. We really need to come together. I would have to say that I would vote for, what we were saying here in terms of, what my colleagues here. Knowing that we've given you an opportunity to work together. The District Assembly started a long time ago, and I was part of that, and it was just basically, just to get ideas, they didn't even have a vote. I don't know how they got a vote. They do have a vote now and we respect that. But we also have to make sure that we do it in such a way that, we do respect one another. And I got the feeling tonight that that's not what you are thinking. You are thinking that the senate is running the campus. (Inaudible background voices- that's the student trustee, sorry about that.) I'm sorry for that 'cause I was not elected to do that. I was

elected to try to work with (voices in the background) the faculty, the students and our administration.

Trustee Harrison: If there isn't any other discussion, we will have a vote. And we will ask a student trustee for an advisory vote.

Trustee Harrison calls for the vote. It passes unanimously (the original version of AB 2410).

(1:06 was the end of discussion on this topic)