



ACADEMIC SENATE

APPROVED MINUTES

August 25, 2011

DIVISION SENATORS: BUSINESS DIVISION, Jesse Saldana;  
CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION DIVISION, Carlos Urquidi;  
COUNSELING DIVISION, Deborah Michelle;  
FINE ARTS DIVISION, Molly Schulps  
HEALTH SCIENCE DIVISION, Judy Swytak;  
LANGUAGE ARTS DIVISION & LIBRARY, Michael Brydges;  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION DIVISION, Bill Pinkham;  
SCIENCE/ENGINEERING/MATH DIVISION, Fumio Ogoshi;  
SOCIAL SCIENCE DIVISION, Bryan Seiling;

2010-2012

SENATORS-AT-LARGE: Ron Armale, John Alexander, Vicki Castle, Nancy Deutsch, Joe Gallo,  
Jolena Grande, Kathy Llanos, Rosalie Majid, Gary Zager;

ADJUNCT SENATOR:

LIAISONS:

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Tiffany Saw and Jasmine Lee;  
BASIC SKILLS: Cherie Dickey  
CAMPUS DIVERSITY:  
CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE: Rosalie Majid;  
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: Mark Majarian;  
FOUNDATION: Beth Piburn;  
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE: Jolena Grande;  
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: Nancy Deutsch  
STAFF DEVELOPMENT: Rebecca Gomez;  
UNITED FACULTY:

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT: Pat Ganer

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT-ELECT: Gary Zager

Senators and Officers Absent: John Alexander, Jolena Grande, Rosalie Majid, Deborah Michelle,

Alternates in Attendance: Beth Piburn until Judy Swytak arrived,

Liaisons in Attendance: Nancy Deutsch, Cherie Dickey, Rebecca Gomez, Mark Majarian, Beth  
Piburn,

Guest: Deborah Ludford, District Director, Information Services

The meeting was called to order by Pat Ganer at 3:05 PM.

- I. Approval of Minutes  
The Senate approved the minutes of May 12, 2011, as written. M/S/P (Llanos/Piburn) with one abstention.
- II. Public Commentary – None.
- III. President’s Report – *Pat Ganer*

A. Board of Trustees Meeting – *Pat Ganer*

There were no “summer magic” decisions made over the past two months when most District employees were on vacation. However, discussion did occur on the following items:

- Preliminary discussions were held on possibly making changes to paying off the District Measure X Capital Appreciation Bond.
- Fullerton College students indicated at a Board meeting their reservations of negotiating an extension of the contract with Sodexo.
- The Board was given a refresher course regarding Parliamentary procedures.
- The Board approved the agreement between Anaheim district and Cypress College on the Teacher Preparation Pipeline Grant.
- There were discussions on priority registration. This summer, first-time students who met matriculation requirements were allowed to register on the first day of registration for new and returning students after legally mandated priority registration for veterans and Disabled Students Programs and Services and Education Opportunity Program and Services students.
- The Cypress College summer session was at 101%. Over the last five years, the College has offered 10,000 fewer seats with actual enrolment down 3,000 students.
- All citizens including District employees are invited to attend the Public Hearing on the district budget on September 13, 2011, at 5:30 p.m.
- Community representatives from the SCE Older Adults Program expressed their displeasure to the Board concerning the drastic cuts to the Older Adults Programs.
- There were numerous responses to accreditation reports. Eva Conrad, the Chair of the 2005 accreditation site visit team to Cypress College was hired to oversee the development of the District’s Comprehensive Master Plan; she will also oversee developing a plan to address the District accreditation recommendations.
- The Board also expressed its commitment to closing the performance gap that exists educationally with various populations and this week discussed directions to the Chancellor’s as to what they see as his job in the coming year.

Before the last Board meeting, Dale Craig of the United Faculty (UF) informed President Ganer that the UF Board was working on identifying a UF representative to the Cypress Senate.

B. District Planning Council – *Pat Ganer*

- There was an expectation of a \$9-11 million cut to the District.
- The District has already seen a workload reduction, or reduction of the number of students we serve, from 6.1%, but expectations are that will rise to 7.5%. State revenues are not as high as previously predicted.
- It is expected that tuition will be raised in December and January to \$46, but Fred Williams believes that the actual collection of that tuition rate will not occur statewide until the summer because students will have already registered and paid the lesser rate.
- No decision has been made as to having summer school in 2012, but the Chancellor wants a decision made in October.
- There were discussions about linkage between the accreditation recommendations and the District Education Master Plan.
- Plans to develop the Program Discontinuance BP and AP were also discussed.
- The proposed policy dealing with social media and the PC and printer replacement policy was also discussed.

C. Cypress College Planning and Budget Committee – *Pat Ganer*

- Several updates on the budget were presented.
- The Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) funded two emergency requests: a lockable cabinet for Health Science to meet HIPAA laws and timers for the Water Polo Program.
- PBC recommended the funding of items 1-7 on the critical needs One-time Funding Requests list approved in Spring 2011: Health Science autoclave; Academic Computing wireless network controller, Library/Learning Resource Center (LLRC) reserve textbook collection; LLRC data base; Physical Plant gates; Transfer Center workstation modification in Counseling area; and equipment and supplies for Anthropology field studies.
- PBC members discussed accreditation recommendations and the District Education Master Plan.
- The Academic Senate President was asked to approve six additional faculty members to participate in the Strategic Planning Colloquium on the afternoon of Thursday afternoon, September 29, and all day Friday, September 30. Senators suggested faculty representatives from DSPS, Health Science, Teacher Prep, and UTAP. One liaison volunteered. It was suggested that one faculty member represent special programs instead of each sending a faculty representative.

D. President's Advisory Cabinet – *Pat Ganer*

- It is highly unlikely that the District will have any new full-time faculty hires.
- A committee had been convened to recommend a name for the Student Center dining room. A tentative recommendation was to name the dining room "The Bolt."
- Smoking on campus was discussed. Gary Zager reported that Dr. Kasler met with the Human Services Club during their first meeting yesterday and put together an informal task force of students who smoke to help identify areas where students could smoke and rules and regulations to govern the area. The purpose is to encourage students to smoke in a nice, pleasant area so that other

students and staff do not have to walk through smoke in and out of every building.

- The proposed Academic Honesty Policy was discussed.

E. Committee Appointments – *Pat Ganer*

Maha Haddad was officially appointed as a Senate representative to the Campus Diversity Committee. President Ganer has sent out an email call for two faculty representatives to the Staff Development Committee.

F. Change in Senate Agenda Order – *Pat Ganer*

President Ganer asked the permission of the Senate to allow the first item of new business to be addressed at this time because Deborah Ludford, District Director of Information Services, was present to discuss the Comprehensive Education Plan.

IV. Faculty Issues – New Business

A. Comprehensive Master Plan – *Deborah Ludford*

Ms. Ludford gave an overview of the timeline to date. Last spring there was general unhappiness expressed with the quality and content of the Comprehensive Master Plan, predominantly by faculty in the District. The biggest area of concern was the educational portion of the plan. The person from the firm charged with writing the plan resigned, and Eva Conrad was brought in to help the committee to reformulate the educational master plan into a form that would be more acceptable to us in the District. She and Nancy Byrnes gathered and reviewed all the documentation collected throughout the process. During the summer, Dr. Conrad and Dr. Byrnes conducted interviews with key leaders from all four entities in the District. She called together 65 people in a half-day workshop in July to discuss an overview of what she saw as the themes of that information.

In late spring, the District received notice of the findings of the Accreditation Commission. The School of Continuing Education (SCE) received a 6-year accreditation. (The accrediting commission and the standards for SCE are different from those of the colleges.) Cypress and Fullerton Colleges received three shared recommendations, all of which dealt with district planning and budget processes. First, the budget process needs to be well documented, transparent, and everyone needs to know how they can impact it, whether on the campus level or the district level. Second, the District needs an integrated planning model. The District has done some great planning, but all of the planning processes haven't come together or been clearly expressed in an integrated fashion. Third, documentation is needed so that the members of the District community will know how they can impact those processes and how budget and planning are integrated. All three of the recommendations must be addressed in the Master Plan and the Colleges must respond to the recommendations by March 15. Meeting such a deadline will be extremely difficult. At the last Board meeting, Eva Conrad, already hired to finish the District Educational Master Plan, was hired to oversee the process to demonstrate that the District has an integrated planning model, a budget model that is transparent and understandable, and that those two processes are integrated processes. More importantly, at the end of clarifying the processes, we will go

through a cycle of planning and budgeting, evaluate the process, and revise it for next time. The advice of Dr. Conrad, who has been an accreditation chair many times, is that the District must get the documentation portion done, hold a few meetings before March, and respond to the accrediting commission. With a plan in place on how we will proceed, we will probably be successful in getting rid of the warning.

Dr. Conrad has formed four more groups: the Strategic Plan Workgroup that will take the Comprehensive Master Plan and try to tie our strategies to it, including the ones that have been developed at the campuses; an Integrated Planning Manual Workgroup that delineates how all of District planning processes fit together; a Decision-Making Workgroup that will outline how the governance structure operates in the District so that we can do that kind of planning; and a Resource Allocation Workgroup that documents the resource allocation process so that everyone knows what is going on and can participate in the process and that the process is driven by planning.

These groups will meet twice, the first meeting in mid-September. Dr. Conrad will give everyone a draft of documentation that exists and the groups will respond. It has become evident that the District does not do evaluation very well, which is a major part of the continuous quality improvement cycle required by the accrediting commission. The workgroups will meet in late October to finalize documents that will go out to everyone in the District for comment. There will be at least a one-month comment period to review, discuss, disagree, debate everything in the documents with the hope that there will be a December adoption so that a January meeting under the new governance structure can be held and the process evaluated. Then the colleges can respond to the accrediting commission that we have a new documented process and governance structure, which has been evaluated, in place.

There are two sets of timelines. The Comprehensive Master Plan chapters 1, 2, 3, and the program descriptions of each colleges have been distributed and are under review now. Next week, the facilities portion of the plan will be distributed. By the end of next week, the whole Comprehensive Master Plan should be out in draft form ready to be reviewed by members of the entire District community. If you do not receive it, contact Deborah. Comments are due back on the first draft by September 15. The comments will be reviewed, revisions made as needed, and then a revised draft sent out by early October and then there will be another comment period with final input and changes. Dr. Conrad is planning to go to the Board for approval in early November. Fullerton Senate has set aside time on non-Senate days to review and discuss the Comprehensive Master Plan and then send recommendations to Dr. Conrad.

One Senator asked what the accrediting commission saw as a reason to give the District three recommendations. Was there evidence that the District was doing something egregiously wrong or was there no documentation of the District processes? Deborah Ludford replied that the accrediting commission does not tell us why they gave us the recommendations. Pat Ganer remarked that the

accrediting commission over the past few years has been looking at planning and budget processes of multi-campus districts and have focused on the continuous quality improvement cycle at the district level. However, districts are not accredited; colleges are, and so if these three recommendations are not addressed and the district level, then the colleges will not receive full accreditation. Deborah referred to an accreditation standard that mentions integrated planning and budget process at the district level in a multi-campus district, i.e. how does the District global vision lead into the college plan and how does the college plan lead to the department plan and how does that drive budget. Another aspect of the integrated planning process is how the district evaluates the process and refines it into a continuous quality improvement cycle.

Discussion centered on the reasons why the spring draft of the Comprehensive Master Plan was rejected. Some felt that the draft centered on department plans rather than a district-wide plan.

One Senator suggested that faculty read the areas of most interest to them in the current draft of the Comprehensive Master Plan, especially the program descriptions.

Another Senator commented that when the Cypress community left the accreditation exit interview, the general feeling was that Cypress did a good job. However, no District recommendations were mentioned at that time. One Senator wanted to know where there was disconnect between the exit interview and the final recommendations came into play. Deborah Ludford answered that from her perception, Cypress College has a well-documented planning process, but it did not come across as integrated with the District plan. Nor did anyone in the District evaluate the District or their college planning process. Another thing that did not come across in the documentation is that we do not drive our budget decisions from the District plan. One last thing that we do not do is to evaluate whether those budget dollars are effective.

One Senator commented that the Cypress College community worked so hard to prepare for accreditation and now we are on another tight deadline to complete an incredible amount of work so that we can receive full accreditation. Another felt that all the responsibility for meeting the accreditation recommendations has been placed on the two colleges, rather than on the District when three of the recommendations were obviously for the District. No one at the District seems to be taking responsibility for the lack of a documented integrated District planning and budget process that is necessary for continuous quality improvement. Instead, the colleges are being told that they have much work to do by March 15.

The Senate thanked Deborah Ludford for her time. Deborah reminded the Senate that she is available as a resource and a conduit with the consultant, and will be working with Kai to write the response to the three District recommendations. She is taking the responsibility of coordinating the action plans to finalize the District Educational Master Plan with a Facilities Plan. If anyone has questions or are discouraged with the process, please direct that person to Deborah.

Pat Ganer asked the permission of the Senate to next address item B under old business on the agenda as a logical follow-up to the previous discussion.

V. Faculty Issues – Old Business

A. Program Discontinuance – *Pat Ganer*

One of the college recommendations for Cypress was that a program discontinuance board policy (BP) be put in place by March 15. Fullerton College, though in the same district, did not receive this recommendation. Pat Ganer passed around a revised draft of a Program Discontinuance Board Policy 4021 that Bob Simpson and she took to the District Planning Council. Dr. Ganer asked the Senate to give her direction on this issue.

Board policies set the basic goals and objectives of a particular issue. It is the administrative procedures (AP) that outlines how program discontinuance will be handled at the District. The District will need to adopt both the BP and the AP. Six years ago, no agreement could be reached on the AP. Fullerton College representatives have argued that a board policy should not be adopted without the administrative procedure. One Senator noted that there are many Board Policies on the website that have no Administrative Procedure. The School of Continuing Education has not expressed their opinion on this issue. While both the BP and AP are necessary, it is the BP that the accrediting commission focused on in their recommendation. The Senate directed the Senate President to move forward on revising and advocating for adopting the BP without the AP if necessary. The President asked Senators to send her any recommendations for revision on BP 4021 so that she can take those revisions directly to the task force.

Dr. Kasler then walked into the room to welcome the Senate back for another academic year. He thanked the Senators for the work they do to participate in college governance throughout the year.

B. Academic Honesty Policy – *Pat Ganer*

Dr. Ganer presented a summary of the Senate's investigation of this issue last spring. At that time, the Senate discussed what actions a faculty member may take when he or she discovers a case of academic dishonesty, plagiarism, etc. According to the College Catalog, the faculty member can give the student an F on the assignment. One faculty member stated that the Education Code gives the faculty member the right to be the sole determiner of grades, including giving the instructor the right to give a failing grade on the course, not the assignment, in a case of academic dishonesty. After hours of discussion, ultimately, the Senate voted to approve that view as the academic honesty policy. The Senate President took the Senate approved policy to the President's Advisory Cabinet (PAC) at the end of the spring semester. Dr. Kasler wanted time to research this issue.

It was again discussed at PAC last week. Based on some of the legal opinions from the State Chancellor's Office on giving a student an F in the course for academic dishonesty, it is very clear that our administration will not support our newly

approved policy on academic dishonesty. The administration accepts the State Chancellor's Office opinion that giving a student an F in the course is a disciplinary issue, not one of assessment of learning in a course; therefore, the Education Code would not apply. Because grading policies fall under the ten plus one topics that are the responsibility of the Senate, the Senate can take the recommendation directly to the Board of Trustees and ask them to approve it. However, if we do, we will have to ask the Board to change several other board policies. BP 5500 item 1.3 identifies cheating, plagiarism, and other academic dishonesty activities as student "misconduct, which constitutes 'good cause' for disciplinary action." Included in the 2011-2012 College Catalog (p.17) is the Cypress College grading policy based on AP 4220 Standards of Scholarship that defines what each grade reflects. Item 1.F states that an F is a "non-passing grade indicating failure to meet minimum requirements earned as a result of non-passing examination scores, inaccurate, incomplete or late assignments, failure to cope with abstract ideas, inadequate mastery of pertinent skills or repeated absence from class." Dr. Ganer pointed out that nowhere does the grading policy state that the F can be the result of a cheating or plagiarism.

Dr. Ganer reiterated that we could go to the Board to make our case, but before we did, she should talk to Fullerton College about changing the Standards of Scholarship, specifically the F grade to include cheating or plagiarism. Changing the academic honesty policy is much more complex than we originally thought last spring and requires additional discussion and input from the faculty in all divisions.

Some Senators commented that today they do not feel today like they did in the spring, especially when it comes to due process for the student. If a faculty member gave the student an F in the course for cheating or plagiarism, the student had no due process on campus. Dr. Ganer replied that the argument had been made last spring that the student did have due process – the student could sue in a court of law.

One Senator stated that she felt it unfair, for example, to give a student an F in the class for cheating on a 50-point quiz out of possible 1,000 points in the course. Dr. Ganer did point out that the legal opinion of the State Chancellor's Office finds it unacceptable to give a student an F for cheating in such a circumstance. However, if there is only one paper or test to measure assessment of learning in the course and if the student cheats on that paper or test that determines the grade in the class, then giving the student an F in the course is appropriate.

In addition, the legal opinion of the State Chancellor's Office is that if an instructor drops a student before the end of the semester for cheating, the instructor is dropping the student for reasons that he is not allowed to drop them for. Dr. Ganer asked to put this issue back on the agenda for the next meeting. She asked the Senate to think about the issues discussed and decide if the Senate wants her to take the new policy to the Board. If the Senate does, then she should consult with the Fullerton Senate.

C. Other – None.



## VI. Faculty Issues – New Business

### B. Request for Cypress College Lecture Series Funding – *Pat Ganer*

The Cypress College Lecture Series proposal and funding process was adopted late last spring. The process that was approved by PAC specified that the Senate would review and approve grant proposals. After Senate approval, the proposal would be presented to Planning & Budget Committee for recommended funding. No specific funding amount was identified at the time.

The Disabled Students Programs and Services have submitted a proposal to the Senate, asking for partial funding in the amount of \$1200 to bring Geri Jewell, an award-winning actress and Cypress College alumnus, to campus. DSPS has already requested partial funding from the Diversity Committee and Associated Students. President Ganer reminded the Senate that one of the tasks for the Senate this year was to develop a selection process for this lecture series. However, in the interest of time, she asked the Senate as a whole to consider this proposal now.

One Senator asked how much funding was available for the CC Lecture Series; Dr. Ganer confirmed no specific funding existed. One Senator asked if funding would be taken from other programs on campus to fund this. All campus funding is finite so every program technically impacts every other program. One Senator suggested that the speaker be asked to remain after the one-hour speech to answer questions from students. Another Senator reminded the Senate that DSPS should send in a report to evaluate the presentation, report how many students, faculty, and staff attended, and identify how effective this presentation was in meeting the goals of the College and the DSPS Program. The need for an evaluation will be taken to the PBC and Institutional Research will be asked to help construct the evaluation. The Senate passed a motion to approve the DSPS funding proposal to bring Geri Jewell to campus. M/S/P (Llanos/Armale) with one abstention.

### C. Social Science Division Renaming – *Bryan Seiling*

As a point of information, Bryan Seiling reported that the Social Science Division voted to change its name to Social Sciences Division, adding an **s** to Science.

### D. Other – None

## VII. Special Reports

A. Associated Students – No report.

B. United Faculty – No report.

C. Staff Development – No report.

### D. Curriculum

Dr. Ganer reported that Mark Majarian, who had to leave, will present information next week about classes that need to be reviewed and the transfer curriculum process.

E. Academic Senate Treasurer's Report – *Ron Armale*  
Ron reported that there is \$187 in the Senate emergency fund in the Schools First account.

F. Campus Technology – *Gary Zager*  
Gary reported that the District has rolled out two new student apps for iPhones and iPads that can be downloaded for free at iTunes. The Android app will be available next week. By September 1, all apps will be available, including one for Blackberry. One app is a college map and a directory of faculty and staff. Students can also look up their grades and their class schedule, the fall College Catalog, and the Schedule of Classes. The School of Continuing Education is piloting a test project using Google email since May. The results have been positive, powerful, and useful.

G. Foundation – *Beth Piburn*  
The Foundation is focused on bringing more participants and monies to the Foundation, all of which benefits our students. Here are dates to remember:

- Golf Tournament – Monday, October 3 at Sea Cliff Country Club
- Evening at the Theater – Friday, October 7 at Cypress College
- Pull for Cypress Campaign – October 21 (More information is coming.)

H. Basic Skills Committee – *Cherie Dickey*  
The Basic Skills Committee will be meeting tomorrow to complete the End of the Year Report to the state. The report now requires a narrative and an evaluation of what we have been doing. Cherie will be attending a workshop in the near future to help with the completion of this report.

I. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – *Nancy Deutsch*  
The SLO Committee has not met. It will meet on Wednesday, September 7, the first Wednesday of the month.

VIII. Announcements

One Senator expressed concern that Department Coordinators have not received any class schedules delineating class times for the 16-week calendar and those schedules must be completed by the end of this semester.

IX. President Ganer adjourned the meeting at 5:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nancy Deutsch, Acting Secretary