ITEM 1.0 GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 Call to Order: President Glen called the meeting to order at 2:20.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes: Stephanie Zappa moved to approve the March 2, 2006 minutes and Michael Absher seconded. The motion carried after minor revisions to the minutes.

2.0 REPORTS

2.1 College President. No report.

2.2 ASCC. No report.

2.3 CLPFA. No report.

2.4 Senate President’s Report: Chad Mark Glen attempted to clarify the erroneous voting outcome of Francisco’s resolution on not participating in the Ad Hoc Budget Cuts Review Committee until the budget allocation model is fixed. President Glen explained that he represented the Senate’s wishes to the ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee did not ask for more time, as provided in the Academic Senate’s second resolution, based on the following letter from the Classified Senate:
Chabot College Classified Senate
March 9, 2006
The Classified Senate will not shirk its responsibility to its constituents. We appreciate the opportunity to participate on the recently formed Ad Hoc committee as part of the shared governance process to review the proposed cuts to the budget. Our focus, understandably, lies on the eleven classified positions that are slated for elimination.

We too agree with Dr. Carlson and the Academic Senate that the allocation model is flawed. This is a reality that’s been known for quite some time. But due to the pressing need for the affected classified staff to make decisions about their employment in the very near future, we cannot support the Academic Senate’s request to postpone the approval of the proposed budget cuts.

Through a signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the District and our union, SEIU Local 790, our colleagues have a special opportunity to explore other employment opportunities within the District. Delaying the decision regarding the budget cuts will give these individuals even less time to find suitable job placements, putting them at an even greater disadvantage in an already bleak situation.

Respectfully,

The Chabot College Classified Senate

President Glen encouraged faculty to attend tomorrow’s College Council meeting to learn more about the proposed reductions in the Measure B Facilities Bond Projects and express their concerns.

Jane Church expressed concern that she had to leave the last meeting due to counseling commitments, and did not get to vote on the resolution. Stephanie Zappa addressed concerns about the Senate meetings running perpetually long. After a discussion where others expressed similar concerns, it was agreed that 1) important items would be placed at the top of the agenda; 2) the minute takers would get the minutes to Senators not later than the Monday prior to Senate meetings; 3) Senators would send their edits to Chad prior to the meeting; 4) we would spend no more that three minutes on approving the minutes; and 5) that we would try to time agenda items in an effort to accomplish more on the agenda and end by 4:15 PM.

2.5 Ad Hoc Budget Cuts Review Committee: Rachel LePell Chaired the Ad Hoc Budget Cuts Review Committee and reported that the committee process was healthy and fair, and the committee members were cognizant of what they were tasked with and acted with integrity. The committee members were provided binders with detailed budget reduction data and information that was utilized and
to make the budget reduction proposal. These binders were made available in
the Library and the President’s Office for anyone to review. Rachel stated that
Dr. Carlson took the committee’s recommendations. Rachel was aware that
there were feelings on campus that the Ad Hoc Committee was a “sham.”
Rachel assured the Senate that the committee was not a sham.

2.6 Public Comments: None.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Stephanie Zappa moved to approve the following RESOLUTION INSISTING ON
SHARED GOVERNANCE IN FORMULATING PROPOSED BUDGET, PROGRAM, AND
PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS, Norman Buchwald seconded and the motion passed
unanimously.

The Academic/Faculty Senate acknowledges the Board of Trustees for pulling
the Chabot Budget Reductions for 2006-2007 from the February 21, 2006 Board
agenda. However, this forced the hasty establishment of an Ad Hoc Budget Cuts
Review Committee, which provided only a small window of opportunity for faculty
and staff to give feedback on the already proposed budget reductions.

There was insufficient time to thoughtfully address the many concerns involved in
the reduction and elimination of programs, services, and classified personnel. It
remains unacceptable that the initial selection of budget cuts was done in
secrecy, and without regard to shared governance; it remains unacceptable that
Program Review was used as an instrument of elimination.

Chabot College is cutting significant programs and services available to students,
while cuts at Los Positas College and the District Office are much less severe.
The District Office was able to make $200,000 of their "cuts" simply by
transferring salaries to Measure B funds. So in effect, they cut $500K compared
to Chabot's $1.4 million. (For comparison: Chabot carries about 40% of the
district's non-instructional costs, compared with about 35% for District Services
and Maintenance and Operations, yet Chabot was asked to cut nearly three
times as much.)

The share of the burden that Chabot is asked to shoulder in these cuts is largely
the result of a bad (not just outdated) budget allocation model, which has never
properly accounted for demographics, programs and services particular to
Chabot. Further, the work of Enrollment Management, a process which is much
better equipped to optimize instructional costs with respect to revenue
generation, was ignored.

The Academic/Faculty Senate insists that the Title V legal mandate of Shared
Governance be observed from the onset, and that all applicable articles of the
District/Faculty Association Collective Bargaining Agreement be followed when
formulating proposed budget, program, and personnel reductions. Furthermore, it is imperative that the budget allocation model be reformulated immediately, so that it is equitable and does not place undue burden on either college, and that no further budgetary decisions be made until an equitable allocation model is in place.

Kathy Kelley asked, as part of the discussion involved in formulating the above resolution, “Who can put the brakes on the District?!” Dave Fouquet stated that the District needs to get on the right side of the 50-Percent Law. Stephanie Zappa said that the Language Arts division sees a management style problem from the College President. This faculty and staff involvement in the proposed budget cuts should have happened a year ago. The Senate had to force the formation of the ad hoc committee. It was agreed that Dr. Carlson is lacking in clear communication to the faculty and college. In reviewing the draft 3/10/06 College Council Meeting Minutes, Kathy Kelly pointed out an example of the President’s poor communications style stating that we needed an explanation on where the money goes. Are the colleges and district independently audited? Administration makes budget reduction decisions while faculty are on vacation. And we’re told that if we really cared we’d show up to meeting to discuss it. Administrators do not come in on their vacation to attend meetings, but faculty are expected to give up their vacation time. Dave Fouquet said that he would check into the legality of the district moving salaries to Measure B funds.

Dave Fouquet moved the following RESOLUTION ON INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES IN LETTERS AND SCIENCE (ISLS), Ming Ho seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The Interdisciplinary Studies in Letters and Science (ISLS) is suspended and not eliminated. ISLS is still in Program Review. Once the Program Revitalization/Discontinuance Process is adopted by the Board of Trustees, the Vice President of Academic Services may, at his prerogative, formally move ISLS out of Program Review and into Program Revitalization. If ISLS is moved to Program Revitalization, the process and timelines will be followed. In all cases, Program Review shall never be used to eliminate a program.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

Senate Voting Clarification: Michael Absher explained the voting confusion at the last Senate meeting. Norman Buchwald read from the first page on the chapter on Voting from Roberts’ Rules of Order—Chapter XIII, page 395. It defines majority as meaning “more than a half,” but also states that the term a “majority vote is used without qualification—as in the case of a basic requirement—it means more than half of the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote, excluding blanks or abstentions, at a regular or properly called meeting at which a quorum is present.” Norman stated that he and Jim Mathews did not
want the voting tabulation to change. Abstentions are neither a yes or no vote. President Glen pointed out that the Senate Constitution states in Article V, Section 1, Subsection c that “Motions shall be approved by a majority of the Academic/Faculty Senate voting at that meeting.” Michael Absher pointed out that a motion could pass with only two Senators voting yes, if most Senators chose to abstain from voting. Norman Buchwald disagreed with Michael Absher that the Rules are open to interpretation as to what constitutes a majority. He said it does depend on how you define “majority,” but Roberts' Rules already defines it. He read the definition again, emphasizing the words that “a quorum is present.” The outcome of the vote is legitimate because there were enough bodies in the room, but all of the bodies do not need to vote. Norman did not see a reason why the Constitution should be amended to define a majority and disagreed with President Glen who asked the Senate if they felt it should be amended to state that it must be the majority of the voting bodies that are at the meeting.

President Glen called abstentions “weak nos” and advised Senators that if they wanted to abstain, they should consider voting no, instead of abstaining to a resolution. Ming Ho, who abstained in Francisco’s resolution, said he did so because he did not feel ready to vote one way or another because he felt he needed more Information as to what would be the consequences of his vote. Norman Buchwald pointed out that an abstention is simply choosing not to vote for or against, and sometimes voting no on a resolution can have consequences just as voting “yes.” He pointed out that if the majority is interpreted as Mike Absher and President Glen asked the Senate to consider, then if he wanted to abstain in the future he would be inclined to leave the room, even if that means a quorum is no longer present. He does not wish to affect an outcome, simply because he is not ready or feel inclined to vote either way. He would rather not have his choice to abstain be interpreted as a “no” vote, meaning to the effect, that a resolution could not pass. Kathy Kelley agreed that it makes a Senator who wishes not to participate feel intimidated, and given such definitions it would define a voter who chose to leave an area of a ballot blank for a candidate or initiative as a vote against— and such an interpretation would be outrageous and undemocratic. Norman Buchwald insisted that Roberts’ Rules definition of what constitutes a majority vote be respected. Kathy Kelley, Ming Ho, and Bill Johnson agreed, Bill Johnson pointing out that he’d rather go by the rules that have been standing for the past two hundred plus years. President Glen said the Senate will continue to respect Roberts Rules, regarding abstentions.

4.1 Senate Resolution Process: President Glen stated that resolutions should be sent in writing to the Senate President prior to Senate meetings. He would not call the question on a resolution that was not written out in front of him. Chad brought Dave Fouquet’s two resolutions to the Senate in electronic form. The Senate utilized the wireless keyboard and the projection screens to edit the two Senate resolutions approved earlier in the meeting. This will be the standard method of proposing resolutions.
4.2 **Senate Constitution:** President Glen asked Senators to review the Senate Constitution and bring back any suggestions for possible revisions.

4.3 **Ad Ho Budget Cuts Review Committee:** Please see item 2.5 above.

4.4 **AS Degree Survey:** Tabled.

4.5 **Board Policy 2260: Political Activity:** Tabled.

5.0 **REPORTS II**

5.1 **Senate Committees:** None.

5.2 **Senators:** Bill Johnson gave everyone in the Senate a chart from the consulting firm DMJM, which contains proposed reductions and cuts of Measure B project funds. He complained that once again, decisions seem to be being made in secrecy and is not including Shared Governance. Mike Absher agreed, saying the Facilities Committee did not hear about this until last week, and most Senators admitted they did not hear about any of this until now. Bill Johnson pointed out significant cuts in the area of the Arts of Humanities, including elimination of the future Mass Communications Building, and the Drama/Music building. Norman Buchwald pointed out that Building 100, which does not just include the Library, is receiving a significant cut from 36.1 million to 13 million. Many questioned what auditing has been done regarding the Measure B funds, and Jane Church felt that the Senate should put together an Ad Hoc Oversight Committee. Norman Buchwald asked what was going on with the auditing that is guaranteed with the Bond. Michael Absher said that he’d like to discuss this issue but it involves at least a forty-five minute discussion. Norman Buchwald moved that this be a discussion item next week and Mike Absher seconded.

6.0 **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**Counselors Assigned to Divisions**— Mike Absher;  
**2006-07 Draft Strategic Plan**— Laurie Dockter;  
**Cheating Update**— Melinda Matsuda;  
**50% Law State Task Force**— Zappa/Zermeño;  
**College Council and IPBC Charges**  
**Program Introduction Process**— Ron Taylor;  
**Construction Effecting Scheduling of Classes**— Stephanie Zappa;  
**Curriculum Committee**— Mike Absher;  
**General Education Reciprocity Program Certification**— Jane Church;
Online Instruction— Rick Moniz

Meeting adjourned at 4:44

Adjournment— Next Meeting— March 23rd*, 2006
Spring Meetings— 2nd & 4th Thursdays: April 6* & 20*; May 4* & 11*
(*Special Meetings— not on 2nd or 4th Thursday).

CMG