

Academic Senate Minutes
January 23, 2012

Meeting Called to Order: 2:02 p.m.

Members present: Dolores Davison (President), Carolyn Holcroft (Vice-President/CCC Chair), Robert Cormia (Secretary/Treasurer), Katherine Schaefer (Adjunct Faculty), Karl Peter (BHS), Eta Lin (BSS), Sam Connell (BSS), Bruce McLeod (FA), Kate Jordahl (FA), Richard Morasci (LA), Pam Wilkes (LRC), Don MacNeil (PE), Patrick Morriss (PSME), Debbie Lee (PSME), Kurt Hueg (Cabinet Liaison), Darya Gilani (Classified Liaison), Meredith Heiser (FA Liaison)

Members Absent: Teresa Ong (ADL), Russell Wong (ADL), Tobias Nava (CNSL), Fatima Jinnah (CNSL), Dixie Macias (PE)

Guests: Chief Ron Levine, Matais Pouncil, Andy Fraknoi, Joyce McLeod-Henderson, Kathleen Turner, Nancy Rogers, Jennifer Sinclair, Lori Silverman, Brian Stanley, Marc Knobel

Agenda Approval: Pass the Torch item was removed; remaining agenda approved by consensus.

Announcements:

- Kate Jordahl has returned from PDL to serve as one of the Fine Arts Division representatives
- This quarter's professional development opportunities are listed on the web; in addition, faculty have the option of signing up for webinars offered through the college.
- Teresa Ong cannot serve on Integrated Planning and Budget and as such we need a new faculty representative
- We need to form the senate elections committee. Bruce McLeod and Don MacNeil will be serving on the committee. Another senator is needed to replace David Marasco. The VP and President positions are open for election this spring.
- La Voz contacted Academic Senate to get comments from unapproved minutes – please do not share senate minutes that have not been approved

Approval of Minutes from November 28, 2011: approved by voice vote

Consent Calendar: Approved with amendments as follow:

Sam McConnell will serve on elections committee
Library (instructional) hiring committee (Jones, Thomas, Wilkes)

Item 1: Smoking policy enforcement / AB795discussion Cormia and Levine

Cormia presented the results of the fall quarter 2011 smoking survey, and a consistent trend for a smoke free campus and/or stricter enforcement (50 to 60%). A change to the smoking policy will provide the ability for campus police to enforce District smoking policy with citations, and each campus will decide where students are allowed to smoke. Fines are civil non-criminal citations beginning at \$25 for first offense, \$50 for the second offense, and \$75 for the third and subsequent offenses, with a maximum fine of \$100 allowed by law. There were questions about where students can smoke, and a map of proposed areas in parking lots outside the perimeter road. Ron stated that there is some discussion to create an on-campus smoking area (i.e., 1300s is a suggested location), however all constituent groups need to agree on this location. A senator raised some questions regarding whether the survey respondents were separated as "smokers" and "non-smokers" in the analyses and whether respondents were able to take the survey multiple times. Cormia responded that it appeared that respondents did not take it multiple times and there is a cross tabs options to look at different variables. Students at AFSC were generally in support of the more restrictive smoking policy, but not a zero smoking policy. Some students reported to the AS student representative that they would like to see accommodations for smokers, but also acknowledged the health concerns for students with respiratory disease. ASFC students were generally not in favor of the proposed 2014 100% smoke free UC policy. The proposed smoke free policy is being brought to each of the shared governance groups and then to Chancellor's Advisory Committee, with enforcement by District police possible in late spring or summer quarter or realistically the beginning of fall quarter. A senator pointed out that during the last discussion on the smoking policy & fines, it appeared that there was consensus regarding the importance of giving a warning before issuing a citation. Ron stated that it would be difficult to keep track of who did or did not receive warning and whether students would take it seriously and stop smoking in certain areas. However, citing versus providing a warning would be up to the officer, so a student who had not previously been cited might be let off with a warning.

Item 2: Matais Pouncil - student services, now has an expanded role with VP Rose Meyer's resignation. The topic of discussion was the new / proposed opportunity for faculty to send exams to the testing center electronically. Acting Vice President Denise Swett has wanted to move to a more electronic environment for managing handling of exams between faculty and the testing center. The key point of discussion was security and workflow of paper and electronic exams, and security in this process.

Many faculty are committed to bringing exams to the testing center in paper format, or dropping off into a secure (locked) box. The testing center has been receiving exams electronically (for years) for proctored makeup exams for other academic institutions, but faculty have always been able to physically deliver the exam to the testing center. There are three methods of deliver exams; electronic, paper drop off at the testing center, and paper drop off in a secure locked drop box in the mailroom. If exams are delivered to the mailroom, the testing center needs to have it about 48 hours in advance. Matais asked faculty not to cut it too close (for example not 10 minutes before the exam). Matais also suggested that faculty could access room 8216 when it is locked with an F40 key. Faculty can no longer give exams to

students; this practice was a violation of testing security concerns. Security with exams is a priority for everyone, both faculty and the testing center, and security of an electronic exam is very important to PSME faculty.

One PSME faculty described having an exam being removed from the testing center and very worrisome about exams being stored electronically where they can be stolen or copied through computer hacking and the importance that the student initiates the process. The discussion then focused on the process where a student gives the educational form to faculty. It is the students responsibility to make an appointment in the testing center to forward a request for makeup or other accommodations. Some faculty still want the ability to physically deliver the exam to the testing center with the physical accommodations form attached to the exam. Matais stated that student accommodations form is going to be online (there will not be a physical form for students to give to the instructors). There was discussion about giving faculty the option of "doing it the old way" and giving faculty time to adjust to the new procedure. Discussion centered on the logistics of getting forms to students to faculty with (and sometimes without) proper student identification information.

A senator voiced the need to be sensitive to the student's right to testing accommodations. How are the form and the envelope routed across campus? The completed form could be emailed to the faculty to be printed later and included with the exam. Faculty commented that the process has changed and now faculty need to know how they are going to be officially 'noticed', and additionally the need to have this information soon as tests are coming (the first set of midterms). There was a comment that many faculty have so many students that it is hard to keep track of everything, especially during the first few weeks of the quarter. Some faculty feel that they are not aware about changes in the testing accommodations protocol, and need/request clarification sooner rather than later.

Questions were asked if EOPS is becoming paperless? There might be segments of EOPS like financial aid for students that are becoming paperless. We do want to try to keep the former paper system working as it is through the end of this quarter, and we should be thinking about how finals will work. There are concerns about finals in the testing center because placement exams will be being conducted at the same time, so it is essential that faculty get finals to the testing center in a timely manner.

One final thought about ensuring that whatever process we develop it is not onerous on students to work with the system, as we are concerned about and committed to 'accommodating' the needs of students. There were also comments by faculty that student involvement in this process enhances student success, and decreases faculty contact.

Item 3: Integrity committee Patrick Morriss discussed the academic integrity committee and the proposal to change mandate and status from an ad hoc to a standing committee. The issue of student cheating alone is big, as a singular charge. However, an additional goal of this committee is to foster a culture of integrity across the campus, such that students would not consider cheating as a means to success. There was a request that the honor code (and other

recommendations from this committee) also be made to academic senate. Patrick suggested that if the committee comes forward with what they believe faculty / integrity really stand for, it will be straightforward for faculty to get behind it. Faculty advocacy groups tend to focus on pay and working issues rather than about academic issues, which is the purview of academic senate. Where do faculty learn shared values? How are we fostering on the shared academic values. It was reminded that Academic Senate adopted AAUP values a number a years ago that might include 'collegiality'. However, this committee cannot be in a position of policing professional ethics. ASFC may need to be involved in the topic of campus-wide academic integrity. Professionalism is a matter of interest to Academic Senate.

There was a comment that a Foothill College transcript might be worth more to a transfer student as it holds a higher degree of integrity (Foothill College less likely to have cheating). There was a comment that this committee might serve as a discernment committee where faculty can come forward and discuss problems, and especially about how faculty should treat each other. A comment what was made that PT faculty should have a way to learn from each other. This discussion will come back to Academic Senate on February 13th for approval, giving faculty time to review and comment on the goals of the integrity committee.

Item 4: The Board of Governors approved the third version of the Students Success Taskforce (SST), and that there is considerable concern by many faculty, staff and colleges over mandates (student education plan) that might not be funded. Consultation Council met on Thursday January 19th and will build workgroups to discuss the various measures in these bills. The original goal of the Student Success Taskforce was to have many or most of the Student Success Taskforce implementations done without funding. Rich Hansen has also been very active in these efforts. Next meeting is next week. The student success taskforce is all about performance based funding. Curriculum reps just have just received recommendations from the Student Success Taskforce, which should be circulated soon. The goals of STS are to benefit students in basic skills, transfer, and workforce. A senator noted that there did not seem to be many changes in the current version of recommendations. Dolores agreed that the content of the recommendations has not changed significantly, however the tone of the document has changed since its first iteration.

Item 5: Committee report out:

- COOL (Committee for Online Learning) meets tomorrow at 12:15 in the Chinese Heritage Building, and will be discussing online evaluations, Banner, and ETUDES issues.
- BoT meeting: the District budget will be significantly impacted by the State budget problems, and enrollment for the district is down significantly, further impacting budget concerns. FHDA is going forward with the Onizuka campus development.
- APM had a discussion about course repeatability and the new drop deadline
- CAC focused on the budget, and a reading of a revised policy on approval of international travel.

For the Good of the Order:

Meeting Adjourned: 4:10 p.m.