

# Resolution with Annotations

## Vote of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees

**Whereas** the Board has avoided meaningful contact with Faculty, Staff and Students. It is out of touch, resulting in a lack of collegiality that compromises the forward movement of PCC; and

- *Board members have refused to come to campus to meet with faculty (Mann, as per M. House)*
- *Board members have refused to attend Senate Town Halls as special guests (Fall 2014, Spring 2015)*
- *Board members have refused Exec Senate offers for communication sessions (Spring 2014–present)*
- *Various Faculty tried—unsuccessfully—to meet with and inform Board members Bill Thomson, Tony Fellow, Berlinda Brown, John Martin, and Linda Wah.*
- *Board Members displayed 100% support of Mark Rocha, giving him a salary increase and an additional contract year in Oct. 2013 (despite the Associated Student’s VNC and despite two successive faculty VNCs)*
- *Roberta Targaz was interrupted by Board president (4/3/2013)*
- *Decorum Policy (10/1/14)*
- *Public Speakers Policy (10/1/14)*
- *Cairo, calendar presentation (6/2014)*
- *Michelson, realignment presentation (8/6/14)*

**Whereas** the Board has persistently ignored shared governance recommendations regarding the College academic calendar, putting at risk student success and creating financial liabilities since 2013; and

- *Ignored shared governance groups as to the effectiveness of Winter for the academic activities of the College ( Academic Years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015), including Calendar Committee, College Council, Academic Senate, Associated Students*
- *Purported rationales for bypassing shared governance have included: Financial Emergencies, Veteran’s Benefits, Pedagogy, Transfer, Student Success, University schedules, K–12 calendars, anticipated new President confusion—but none of these were backed with solid data.*

**Whereas** the Board has not directed Administration to follow written policy and established practice in the areas of ethics, hiring of faculty and management, and college oversight, resulting in a lack of confidence in the management of the college; and

- *Measure P: Voters approved new arts building with ceramics, printmaking and sculpture facilities, however these were removed without a subsequent plan (see public comments from Citizen’s Oversight Committee 4/22/15)*
- *Policy Violation in allowing students to over-enroll in summer units*
- *Policy 6300.20: limits terms of interim or acting administrative appointments violated in multiple instances (2011-2014)*
- *Policy 6100.09, 6100.10: faculty hiring priorities (2011-2012, 2013-2014)*
- *Policy 6300.10: hiring must follow open competitive external search bypassed to hire police chief (Spring 2013)*

**Whereas** the Board of Trustees is responsible for the selection and evaluation of the President, but the Board's poor choices in the selection of the last two Presidents has cost taxpayers thousands of dollars and has resulted in a dysfunctional college culture; and

- *Four presidents since the last accreditation cycle, of which half (Dr. Paulette Perfumo and President/Superintendent Dr. Mark Rocha) did not serve out their tenure; and*
- *These two former presidents received substantial severance packages from the college*

**Whereas** AB 1725 has established shared governance procedures that mandate faculty, staff, and student participation in matters that affect them, including the presidential hiring and evaluation process, while the Board removed faculty and staff representation from the President's Evaluation Policy and has not restored it; and

- *President's Evaluation Resolution – The Board's revision of Policy 1680 underscores its disregard for the spirit of participatory governance and its legal mandate under the Ed Code and Title 5.*
- *The Board's revision of Policy 1680 reduced college participation in Presidential evaluations to every 4 years, instead of the established 2 year interval.*
- *The Board's revision of Policy 1680 establishes the collection and tallying of evaluation responses so as to deny the anonymity of faculty, classified and management respondents.*
- *The Board's revision of Policy 1680 grants the Board and President authority to hire an independent evaluation firm/consultant to conduct the evaluation.*
- *The Board's revision of Policy 1680 now stipulates that no "anonymous and unattributed comment will be included" and that the firm or consultant hired by the Board and the President would "receive attributed comment in person and prepare a written report for the Board... to be shared with the Superintendent/President."*

**Whereas** the Board has not provided any written response to multiple separate Senate Resolutions, resulting in the perception that they are disinterested in the impact of their actions on the college; and

**Whereas** the Board has disregarded the Brown Act [and Board policies] by limiting seats for Board meetings, locking meeting room doors, and making inappropriate decisions in closed sessions, leading to a lawsuit against the College;

- *CalAware Lawsuit: Fall 2014: did not report closed-door meeting decisions regarding President's severance / retirement package: subsequent misleading messages to the press/public (See LA Times article, Aug. 15, 2014)*
- *Summer -Spring 2014: Brown Act #54956.6/Board Policy 1240: refusal of multiple public members' requests to agendaize college-related business (eg: Follow up on President Perfumo's continued duties post-college presidency)*
- *August 29, 2012: March 13, 2013, July 17, 2013, November 7, 2013: Turned away members of the public even though seats were available. (Board Policy 1200/Ed Code 70902: alternate, larger facilities should be sought if facilities prove to be inadequate)*
- *AY's 2012–2014: Inaccurate signage in front of Board of Trustees meeting advertising 80 as the limit for members of public; Fire Marshall consultation and fire code capacity prove otherwise*

**The Academic Senate of Pasadena City College hereby registers a vote of 'no confidence' in the Board of Trustees, for their failure to uphold and value Shared Governance principles and general principles of openness and fairness in their dealings with campus constituent bodies, thereby jeopardizing the College's accreditation. The Board must follow its own policies and conform to the California Title V Shared Governance guidelines.**