

ACADEMIC SENATE
Approved Minutes for March 26, 2015
Place: CCC – 414 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm

ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICERS		PRESENT
President	Jolena Grande	X
Past-President	Gary Zager	ABSENT
Secretary	Bryan Seiling	X
Treasurer	Laurie Morvan	ABSENT
Curriculum Chair	Mark Majarian	X
ACADEMIC SENATORS		
Business/CIS	Jesse Saldana	X
Career Tech. Education 1	Kathleen Reiland	X
Career Tech. Education 2	Michael Klyde	X
Counseling 1	Renee SSensalo	X
Counseling 2	Renay Laguana-Ferinac	X
Fine Arts 1	Jim Hormel	X
Fine Arts 2	Paul Paiement	X
Health Science 1	Lynn Mitts (left at 4:48)	X
Health Science 2	Jane Walker	X
Health Science 3	Tina Johannsen for Rebecca Gomez	X
Language Arts 1	Sarah Jones	X
Language Arts 2	Liana Koepell for Keith Vescial	X
Language Arts 3	Pat Ganer	X
Library/Learning Resource Center	VACANT	VACANT
Physical Education	Nancy Welliver	ABSENT
Science, Engineering, Math 1	Adam Eckenrode for Laurie Morvan	X
Science, Engineering, Math 2	Michelle Palmisano for Joel Gober	X
Science, Engineering, Math 3	Ron Armale	X
Social Science 1	Bryan Seiling	X
Social Science 2	Craig Goralski	X
Adjunct Senator 1	Tonya Cobb	X
Adjunct Senator 2	J. Y. Ho	X
Adjunct Senator 3	Mark Popeney	X
LIAISONS		
Associated Students	Tanya Washington	X
Campus Diversity	VACANT	VACANT
Campus Technology	Doug Sallade	ABSENT
CC Foundation	Lynn Mitts	X
Program Planning and Review	Kathleen Reiland	X
Staff Development	Peggy Austin (arrived at 3:40)	X
United Faculty	Randa Wahbe	ABSENT
Basic Skills	Cindy Shrout	ABSENT
Student Learning Outcomes	Sarah Jones	X
GUESTS: Michael Brydges, Nancy Deutchsh, Cherie Dickey, Mary Forman, Susan Klein, Kathy Llanos, Kathy Wada, Eldon Young		

- I. After establishing a quorum, President Jolena Grande called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. with four alternates in attendance.
- II. **Adoption of the Agenda:** After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, agenda Item J: Role of the Senate in Department/Division Issues and agenda item I: Resolution of Condemnation of Unprofessional Conduct were both moved to the top of Unfinished Business. Under New Business, agenda item C: Resolutions for Spring Plenary Session was set for 4:00 pm to accommodate the time-sensitive nature of the item (Johannsen/Seiling). The vote was unanimous with no abstentions.

The Senate moved to limit the time on debate for each item to the time stated on the Agenda (Seiling/Armale). The vote was unanimous with no abstentions. On motions duly made and seconded, the Agenda was approved by unanimous vote.

- III. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes for the March 12, 2015 Senate meeting were approved as submitted (Koepell/Seiling). The vote was unanimous with Senator Walker abstaining.
- IV. **Public Commentary:** Director of the Cypress College Foundation Raul Alvarez addressed the Senate on the planned 50th Anniversary Celebrations that will be taking place during the 2016-17 school year. One theme will be the “Celebration of Stories.” The various programs, clubs, departments and other campus entities will be asked to share their stories. The groups will be asked 3 questions: 1) What’s your group’s story?, 2) What’s your idea for telling that story, and 3) Who will tell your story? There will be three audiences: the campus community, the local community, and alumni and retirees. The Senate will be asked to participate. The issue is being placed on the agenda for the next Senate meeting for further discussion.

Dean of Language Arts Eldon Young addressed the Senate in opposition to creating a Senate sub-committee to look into the internal disputes within his division. He stressed that it is his belief that these issues have been resolved.

Cypress College President Dr. Robert Simpson spoke regarding recent issues that have been brought to the Senate for discussion. He stressed that the Senate has the right to take up whatever business it feels is relevant, but he made two observations. First, the Senate meetings are too long and the agendas contain too much business. Second, the issue of unprofessional conduct in the Language Arts Division is really one that can’t be resolved by the Senate. He asked if anyone disagreed with the belief that we should all treat people with courtesy, respect, professionalism, and civility. He asserted that he has transgressed in the past, has apologized, and hopes he’s forgiven. We then hope to move on. He referenced four things to consider when speaking: 1) Is it the Truth? 2) Is it fair to all concerned? 3) Will it build goodwill and friendships? and 4) Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

Senator Seiling began to read comments from an anonymous letter he received in his campus mailbox addressed to President Grande and himself. A discussion ensued about whether or not such anonymous material could be read in the Senate during Public Commentary. The discussion focused on how to balance the concern for such unsigned comments with the need for some to have an avenue to express their thoughts freely. A motion to exclude anonymous comments from being read in Public Commentary was defeated: 6 Yes and 15 No. Senators voting Yes: Cobb, Ganer, Ho, Jones, Koepell, and Walker. Senators voting No: Armale, Eckenrode, Goralski, Hormel, Johannsen, Klyde, Laguana-Ferinac, Majarian, Mitts, Paiement, Palmisano, Popeney, Saldana, Seiling, and Ssensalo.

Senator Seiling read a portion of the letter not related to other business on the agenda. There was concern expressed about how the Adjunct Senators are listed on the sign-in and minutes as well as concerns as to how Adjunct Faculty are represented by the current Adjunct Senators. A suggestion for having an Adjunct Senator from each division was made. (A full copy of the remarks made in Public Commentary can be found in Appendix A).

- V. **Faculty Announcements and Invitations:** President Grande reminded all in attendance about the Area D meeting in El Cajon on March 28th.

VI. **Special Reports**

- A. **Associated Students:** Tanya Washington reported that AS is looking forward to a busy April and the many club activities that are planned. The Marine Biology Club will be hosting a beach cleanup at Seal Beach. The LGBT Club will host a bonfire at Bolsa Chica State Beach. The Women's Recognition Team will host an awards event in Gym II on April 8th. World Fest will be on April 15th from 11:30 am to 1:30 pm by the pond. The Human Services Club is doing a Comeback Clothes Drive for the needy through April 10th. All clothes, blankets, comforters, and like goods are being collected. Drop off bins are available around campus. Sex Day, a celebration of cultural diversity and human sexuality, will be April 22 from 11am to 1 pm by the pond. AS is also working on revising their core values. They include commitment, collegiality, integrity, spirit, and connectivity.
- B. **United Faculty:** Alternate Senator Johannsen reminded the Senate that UF elections end on March 27th at noon. The CCA Who Awards are in late April, and UF has nominated Dr. Barbara Marshall for her many years of work and dedication. The negotiating team, led by Dr. Marshall, has made a salary counter-proposal to the District. They are awaiting a response from the District on April 6th.

- C. **Staff Development:** A final funding period for conference funding will be extended from April 10th to April 17th to accommodate Spring Break.
- D. **Curriculum Committee:** Curriculum Chair Mark Majarian informed the Senate that the pre-launch deadline for classes 2010 or older is March 27th. The deadline for other courses is June 30th. For the current curriculum cycle, Independent Study shells should be left alone.
- E. **Academic Senate Treasurer's Report:** No Report
- F. **Cypress College Foundation:** Lynn Mitts echoed the comments made by Raul Alvarez in Public Commentary. The Senate is going to need to present its story and the history of the Senate. There was discussion of creating a Senate storyboard to tell the story. The issue will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
- G. **Basic Skills Committee:** No Report
- H. **Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:** No report
- I. **Program Review and Department Planning:** No report
- J. **District Council on Budget and Facilities:** President Grande reported that DCC discussed the potential for a state capital bond. The District has two projects on the state's list, the SEM building at Cypress and the Humanities building at Fullerton. Due to being \$70 million short in our current construction needs, these state funds would be a welcome addition. A state bond measure would force the District to delay some of the proposed construction.

VII. President's Report:

The Senate approved the following committee appointments by unanimous vote:

1. Student Equity Plan Committee – Mary Forman and Jennie Hurley
2. SSSP Manager Hiring Committee – Jaime Ramos and Keith Vescial
3. Self Study Chair Search Comm. – Jolena Grande and Kathleen Reiland
4. Campus Diversity Committee – Kevin Barness

The Senate still needs to make appoints to the following committees:

1. District Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Committee (2 needed)
2. District Technology Coordinating Committee

President Grande reported that the Graduation Committee was looking for readers and reminded everyone about the Faculty Awards. Senators are encouraged to go back to their Divisions and get nominees. Cypress College

also needs to select a nominee for Orange County Department of Education Teacher of the Year Award. After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate moved to forward the name of Becky Floyd, last year's recipient of the Outstanding Full-Time Faculty Award (Goralski/Seiling). The vote was unanimous with no abstentions.

Senator Seiling reported on discussions in PBC and PAC. While there was not a voting quorum in PBC, there was discussion of the recent survey on the Vision and Goals of Cypress College. The survey was overwhelmingly positive, but Dr. Bandyopadhyay focused on some of the negative comments. Dr. Bandyopadhyay stated that each person could fill out a survey anyway they wanted, but he expected a level of professionalism when doing so. Surveys are designed to help gather information and suggestions on how we can improve the great work we do.

Senator Seiling reported that a similar discussion also took place in PAC. He stated that the discussion focused on the good work we do at Cypress College, and that the recent focus on the issues within the Language Arts Division has distracted the Senate from focusing on that good work. Senator Seiling addressed AS Representative Tanya Washington in going around the room and highlighting the good work done on the campus. He stressed that such good work should be the focus of Senate business.

VIII. Faculty Issues – Unfinished Business

A. Resolutions for Spring Plenary Sessions:

President Grande presented the proposed resolutions being voted on at Spring Plenary. She wanted feedback to take to the Area D meeting in El Cajon. There was discussion of some of the proposals, changes to the by-laws, and the focus on CTE courses and their funding. No serious objections were raised to any of them. The Senate will still need to determine how many people they want to send to the Spring Plenary Sessions in San Francisco and whether they will support funding people's attendance.

B. Role of Senate in Addressing Department/Division Issues

Senator Seiling addressed the topic of the Senate taking up the internal issues of a department or program. He reiterated that there were underlying issues in the Language Arts Division that were creating a "whack-a-mole" situation for the Senate. He asserted the need for the Senate to create a committee to mediate those issues. He stressed that this was not some power grab but an effort to address the issues once and for all.

English Professor Mary Forman spoke in response to comments made by Senator Seiling in the last meeting suggesting that he was refereeing personal issue between departments. She stated that the issues were academic and professional and not personal and had been resolved through the normal campus processes. She stated that Senator Seiling was also taking a passage

related to issues in the Language Arts Division from the Educational Master Plan out of context. She went on to say that Phil Dykstra has stated that the issue between the departments in the EMP is no longer an issue. Professor Forman condemned Senator Seiling for mucking up the process. (A full copy of the remarks made in Public Commentary can be found in Appendix B).

Senator Goralski stated that the issues being raised by Senator Seiling were not his alone. He has been approached by several faculty from the Language Arts Division about these issues. He agrees we have been playing “Whack-a-Mole” and need to resolve the underlying issues.

Senator Ganer expressed concern about what the committee was actually tasked with doing. She recounted the times that Language Arts issues had come up in the Senate and disputed that the Language Arts Division was taking up a large amount of Senate time on these issues as Senator Seiling contends.

After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate failed to pass a motion creating a committee to look into the internal disputes within the Language Arts Division. The motion failed 5 to 13 with 2 abstentions. Senators voting Yes: Goralski, Johannsen, Klyde, Seiling, and Ssensalo. Senators voting No: Armale, Cobb, Eckenrode, Ganer, Hormel, Jones, Koeppel, Majarian, Mitts, Paiement, Palmisano, Saldana, and Walker. Senators Ho and Popeney abstained.

C. Resolution of Condemnation of Unprofessional Conduct:

Alternate Senator Koeppel presented the Resolution of Condemnation of Professional Conduct for a second reading.

After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate moved to strike “that took place in the Language Arts Division” from the Resolution (Saldana/Ganer). The motion passed 13 to 1 with 7 abstentions. Senators voting Yes: Armale, Cobb, Eckenrode, Ganer, Goralski, Ho, Jones, Klyde, Koeppel, Mitts, Palmisano, Popeney, and Saldana. Senators voting No: Seiling. Senators Hormel, Johannsen, Laguana-Ferinac, Majarian, Paiement, and Ssensalo, and Walker abstained.

Senator Seiling read another excerpt from an anonymous letter he received. It was critical of the Resolution of Condemnation. (A full copy of the letter can be found in Appendix A).

Senator Popeney raised the question of the Senate addressing this issue. Based on the vote in the previous agenda item, he asked whether the Senate had already decided not to get involved in the personal matters of the Language Arts Division.

After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate moved to support the Resolution of Condemnation. (Koeppel/Ganer). The motion passed 9 to 8 with 4 abstentions. Senators Voting Yes: Armale, Cobb, Ganer,

Jones, Koeppel, Mitts, Paiement, Saldana, and Walker. Senators Voting No: Goralski, Hormel, Johannsen, Klyde, Majarian, Popeney, Seiling, and Ssensalo. Senators Eckenrode, Ho, Laguana-Ferinac, and Palminsano abstained.

Due to the close vote, an appeal was made for the chair to vote. President Grande voted in favor of the Resolution of Condemnation confirming that it passed 10 to 8 as amended.

D. Funding Allocations for New Courses/Programs:

The Senate continued to discuss the need to balance innovation in instruction and programs while being mindful of the costs. Curriculum Chair Majarian stated that there are procedures already in place to handle this issue. After debate and on motions duly made, the Senate moved that any additional need by a program beyond the initial request would go through the one-time funding process in PBC. The vote was unanimous with Senators Ho, Klyde, Koeppel, Laguana-Ferinac, and Ssensalo abstaining.

E. Campus Reassigned Time Discussion:

After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate created a sub-committee to research the allocation of reassigned time on campus (Seiling/Cobb). CTE membership on the committee is being sought. The vote was unanimous with no abstentions.

F. Campus Maintenance Hour:

After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate created a sub-committee to look into the issue (Seiling/Armale). The vote was unanimous with no abstentions. The committee consists of President Grande and Senators Hormel and Seiling. Others are encouraged to join. The committee will make a preliminary report at the next Senate meeting.

G. Campus E-Mails for Students:

Senator Ho presented the idea of getting students campus e-mail accounts. This would facilitate students getting discounts on books and other educational materials. It was suggested that Mike Kavanaugh address the Senate on the topic. After debate and on motions duly made and seconded, the Senate created a sub-committee to look into the issue of giving students their own campus e-mails (Ho/Seiling). The vote was unanimous with no abstentions.

IX. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bryan Seiling

Academic Senate Secretary

Video of the meeting may be viewed at youtube.com.
The Minutes of all Academic Senate meetings can be found at
<http://www.cypresscollege.edu/facultystaff/senate>.

Appendix A: Anonymous Letter Read in Public Commentary by Bryan Seiling

I would like to ask the Academic Senate why, if Academic Senators are given in alphabetical order according to the Division they represent in the Senate minutes, do Adjunct Senators appear at the end when Adjunct starts with an A?

I would also like to point out that the Adjunct Senators have only sent two campus emails to adjunct instructors (see attached). The rest of the discussion, if there is one, seems to be taking place at a Facebook Page, which leaves out any and all instructors who do not use social media or who don't believe that it is a good place to discuss professional matters. Other Division Senators can inform their constituency and get feedback through divisional and departmental meetings as well as by sharing the same space. Since there is no such thing as an Adjunct Division, since adjunct instructors are not welcomed at their respective divisional and departmental meetings, and since there seems to be a rush on the part of some Senators to vote on issues, adjuncts are not properly informed or given time to provide feedback, and the vote of Adjunct Senators can represent only them or those they are in contact with, which are not all the adjunct instructors, as it should be. This makes adjunct representation, at best, very partial. Without suggesting any wrong doing, just out of common sense, given the discussion taking place about Language Arts matters and that one of the Adjunct Senators is from that Division, it is the trust that we would like to have in the Senate that is at stake in this matter. Would the Senate consider discussing the inclusion of adjunct faculty at divisional and departmental meetings, an option that is made possible to Adjunct Faculty in most colleges, and amending its Constitution so that adjunct faculty can be represented, in those cases in which it is possible, by an adjunct instructor from their own Division, instead of from a non-existent Adjunct Division? Is there any reason why should proper democratic participation and representation be feared unless it is a dictator at heart who fears it?

In relation to the recent discussion and vote to change the language in the Language Arts issue from department survey to personal correspondence, can the Senate explain how a department survey can be considered private when, even in those cases in which it explicitly states that it is confidential or that answers can be given anonymously, by its very nature, its results are meant to be known, analyzed and used as a guide? Can handwriting the answers or including personal information turn it private and, if so, is it appropriate to include information of a personal nature on a department survey? Can the Senate explain why so much weight is being put on the messenger and so little on the message? Doesn't AP3050 apply to someone who blames, not a colleague's actions, but the colleague herself as the source of her frustration? Isn't this personal and, as such, uncollegial and unprofessional? If the instructor answering the survey defiantly states that all she regrets is misspelling the colleague's name, what's so wrong About letting everyone know about something that she is so proud of? Where is the offense to the integrity of the college when no one stole the survey and when the involved respondent believes that she herself left it in the wrong mailbox? Where is the crime in taking whatever action we see fit regarding what is left in our mailboxes, without even asking? Don't we receive at times mail that, although addressed to someone else, is passed on and shared? Why should someone be punished fro the carelessness of another one? Why should the messenger apologize while the offender remains proud of her offense? Does the Language Arts Division or the ESL Department in particular, regularly give out surveys or was the intention of this one to elicit answers that would justify attacks and actions against a colleague? Can proof be provided that giving out surveys is a regular

practice within the Language Arts Division or the ESL Department? Why do Language Arts Senators condemn the distribution of a message but not its content when plain human decency calls for the defense of a colleague that is personally attacked without the possibility of defense, even more so when they are supposed to be representing that colleague as a member of their Division? Is it because they support the attack themselves? Do Division Senators only speak up for those with whom they agree? Does the Academic Senate have provisions to deal with the partisan use of the Senate? Furthermore, if the Language Arts Division voted 18 in favor and 2 against the Resolution and the Language Arts Senators state that the copy of the survey was sent to about 40 instructors, how can they claim a majority, where are the other 20 or so, not to mention their adjunct faculty? If they can claim such strong support within their Division, why bring the issue to the Senate? What is there to be gained that they don't already have according to their own report? After all, it is a divisional issue, not a Senate issue. Should then Academic Senate also overlook that, at least, 2/3 of the college voted to end the senator-at-large system that gave the Language Arts Division preponderance at the Senate for many years?

Since it seems to be also related to the discussion regarding the Reading Department use of the English name, why is it that this argument is taking place within the Division and spilled out into the Senate when it is the District who clearly calls one department English and the other one Reading? Why is it that the Reading Department doesn't make its claim to the District? Since there are three Academic Senators from the Reading Department, not counting the colleagues in the entourage that follows them to most meetings, can they tell us if it was their understanding when they were hired that they were going what is understood as English courses or that they were going to teach what is understood as Reading courses? Putting aside areas of specialization within the general field, can a Reading instructor teach the same course as an English instructor? When was English added to the name of the Reading Department at Cypress College and by whom? What was the reason given, considering that both, the District and Fullerton, call it only Reading? Did the Academic Senate play a role then? Is there an advantage for the Reading Department to be called English Reading? Is there a possible disadvantage in being the Reading department? Since there have been talks of moving ESL and Reading to the School of Continuing Education, can the name make a difference? Would it change the nature of the courses or allow those in the Reading Department to claim that they go beyond just Reading? Is English 099 related to this? Is it related to Reading or to ESL and, if it is related to ESL, would it allow ESL to claim a different status? Could it be that fear is guiding behaviors that some pretend to pass as professional when they are vicious and irrational?

Thank you for your time. I'm sending this anonymously to avoid us the pain of another witch-hunt. I don't want to go without saying that the tradition of acceptance, understanding, and collaboration of our college was shaped, in part, by those of you in the Language Arts Division who have been around for a long time and who now seem intent on destroying your own work, which makes it all the more painful. Is this absurd fight really what you want your legacy to be? Please, reconsider. Human beings don't lose face for extending their hands but we can all lose our humanity if we don't.

Appendix B: Letter Read in Public Commentary by Mary Forman, Cypress College English Department Professor

I watched the Academic Senate meeting on video and was distressed about the way Senator Brian Seiling referred to himself as a “referee” in the “personal” disputes in the Language Arts Department. While the President of the college has rightly called the issues between the Language Arts faculty “academic and professional,” this senator has characterized the issues in our Division as “personal” and admonished our Division for its failure to resolve its problems. I would like to remind Senator Seiling that the issues at hand in our Division are, primarily, pedagogical. As passionate, educated, and dedicated individuals, the Language Arts faculty feel compelled to uphold their pedagogical stances. They are standing up for what they believe in and are trusting that the processes that are in place will help them to safeguard the integrity of their programs. To me, that is an *academic* disagreement, not a *personal* one.

My understanding of the Senate is that it is the Senate’s job to handle just such academic issues in a professional manner through an agreed upon process. Part of that professionalism means representing the Language Arts Division in a fair and accurate way. This is not what I saw in the last Academic Senate meeting when Senator Seiling referenced problems with the Language Arts Division and the Educational Master Plan. Senator Seiling stated that there was a *big problem* with an overlap in departments in our Division. Reviewing the Educational Master Plan, basically I found that it identified a number of areas on campus in which an overlap of departments made data collection convoluted. Language Arts was only one area among several that had this problem. However, our Division addressed this issue some time ago by asking the Institutional Researcher, Phil Dykstra, to investigate the matter. In a Division meeting, he told us that it was a relatively simple matter to change the data collection method. Problem solved. By presenting this information out of context and insisting that there was a “big problem” that had to be resolved, Senator Seiling was doing exactly what he has accused our Division of doing: “mucking up the process.”

In fact, after the last Senate meeting, I was no longer even sure what the issue was that the Senate was discussing in regards to the Language Arts Division. I know there is the resolution regarding the illicit copying of the piece of correspondence, but what other issues are at hand?

If Senators are going to act as “referees,” then they must be fair and well-informed. They must not “muck up the process” by asserting there are problems

where there are none. Frankly, I was insulted when Senator Seiling said that he had “no confidence” in the Language Arts Division’s ability to resolve its own issues. Faculty in the Language Arts Division have worked hard to address and resolve these problems. It would be helpful to all involved if Senator Seiling could acknowledge that the Language Arts Division has, in fact, already resolved the majority of these issues.

Thank you for listening. Mary Forman
Professor of English