

ACADEMIC SENATE
COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
csmacademicsenate@smccd.net

Governing Council Meeting

Feb. 10, 2004

Members Present

Tom Diskin	President	Craig Blake	Business/Creative Arts
Martha Tilmann	Vice President	Jackie Gamelin	Counseling
Lloyd Davis	Secretary	Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer	Tim Karas	Library
Rick Ambrose	Past President	Linda Phipps	Math/Science
		Anne Stafford	Language Arts

Others Attending

Sylvia Aguirre	Counselor	Jessica Mercado	ASCSM
Pat Griffin	VPSS, CSM	Ruth Turner	EOPS/Counselor

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:22 p.m. The agenda was approved, with the following changes: under New Business, the Student Equity Plan was moved to right after the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy, and a short presentation by CTL director Jim Petromilli on equipping smart classrooms was added to Future Agenda Items. Approval of the minutes of Jan. 27 was put over to the next meeting.

TREASURER'S REPORT Rosemary reported a balance of \$6940.57 in the Senate checking account.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

District Academic Senate (DAS) considered several items at its Feb. 9 meeting.

- 1) It approved the proposed District PIV (**Program Improvement and Viability**) Policy (formerly the Program Improvement and Discontinuance Policy.) This policy must be approved by the Board of Trustees.
- 2) ASCCC is holding curriculum colloquia in Oakland Feb. 27, to consider stiffer math and English A.A. and A.S. **degree requirements**. The changes will be discussed at ASCCC's Spring Plenary session, and decided on at the fall session.
- 3) DAS president Connie Beringer wants more faculty to serve on the **District Housing Committee**. The proposed housing project, on District property, is awaiting approval by the City of San Mateo Planning Commission. There is fairly strong opposition from a highly organized group of Parrott Drive residents.
- 4) The **Bookstore Committee** is determining questions to ask the three groups proposing to operate the bookstores, following up on the campus open forums. Its first meeting of this semester will be Feb. 11. Craig Blake is taking over Tom's seat on that committee.
- 5) The **DAS website** is up and running. It has a link on the District portal page. Tom will update CSM's Academic Senate web page, then link it to the DAS page.
- 6) **Faculty hiring guidelines** are being finalized, to go to the Board of Trustees in March or April.
- 7) DAS will discuss **degree audit** policy next month, then send it back to college Governing Councils. Regina Stanback-Stroud gave us a presentation on this last fall. DAS wants more standardization of district and college policies, and hopes to see the policy finalized this semester.
- 8) DAS discussed the **student tuition assistance plan** proposed by new Trustee Dave Mandelkern. We will consider it today under New Business.

District Shared Governance Council (DSGC) met last week. Executive Vice Chancellor Jim Keller presented an update on the **budget**. The state requires the district have a **flex activities** subcommittee. Ours will be a subcommittee of DSGC, with one representative from each constituency. Connie Beringer will represent faculty.

VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT Martha reported on the Jan. 28 **Board of Trustees** meeting, at which Barbara Christensen went over the District's housing proposal. Concerns from the neighbors are mainly about noise and

traffic. They want a guarantee that it will be only for campus housing. The project seems very likely to be approved by the City of San Mateo Planning Commission. People in the District and the community are trying to work together. The project has been reduced from three stories to two, the number of units has been reduced a little, and parking has been moved away from the backyards of the neighbors. If approved, groundbreaking will be in June or July.

Trustee Dave Mandelkern is working to initiate a program to be administered by the Foundation, in which donations would defray fees of needy students. The Board also heard a presentation by CSM's College Council on learning outcomes and accreditation.

Rick reported that at the most recent meeting of the **District Committee on Budget and Finance**, it was agreed by general consensus that we would plan the 2004-05 District budget on a best case scenario of a deficit of \$369,000, of which CSM's share would be approximately 39%. It is likely that the unrestricted general fund balance for the District and managed hiring funds would be enough to cover the deficit. If the \$15 billion bond measure does not pass in March, all bets are off and the outcome could be entirely different. A contingency plan is being considered that would look at the above savings measures as well as tightening more operating expenditures and looking at delaying funding the post-retirement fund benefits for a year and perhaps borrowing monies from the fund. There is current discussion at the state level of setting a COLA of 1.84% and rolling PFE as well as Matriculation monies and part-time costs into the states unrestricted general funds. This would not be very desirable for our District in that it would move us further from attaining basic aid (self-supporting) status.

INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

ASCCC Spring Plenary Session will be April 15-17 at the SFO Westin Hotel in Millbrae. The last day to register at the \$295 rate is April 5. Lower one-day rates are available. Registration is usually paid from the college budget for Academic Senate. Tom and Martha will attend, and would like to know by Feb. 24 who else would like to. The agenda should be posted soon on the ASCCC website.

CSM will host the **ASCCC Area B meeting** on Friday, March 26, probably in the Gallery Room from 11:30-2:30. Governing Council members are asked to attend, and learn about the focus of the plenary session and the resolutions to be considered there.

ASCCC Math/English Colloquia will be held Feb. 27 at Peralta College in Oakland, to consider proposed changes in AA/AS math and English requirements. These will be discussed at Spring Plenary.

ASCCC is offering its annual **Jonnah LaRoche Memorial Scholarships** (\$500 for a transferring student, \$250 for each of two continuing students.) The application deadline is Feb. 27.

Work continues on our final wish list for **18-176 renovations**. Members discussed the pros and cons of offering to pay for some of the work in 18-176. The college, not the Senate, should provide facilities, but paying for our own furniture would mean we would not be restricted to two or three district-approved vendors. Tom recalled that at our last meeting we gave Swerington the priority list they needed. It is likely that there will be money for items at the top of the list (finishing, smart room infrastructure, possibly also furniture) but not for smart room hardware, a soundproof partition, or kitchen renovation. Jim Petromilli will give a presentation on smart classrooms at a future meeting. It could give us ideas for updating 18-176.

Faculty are asked to respond to the **Campus Improvement Survey** they recently received by e-mail. Prepared by John Stewart, it will help set priorities for using bond money.

Tom distributed the handout from Jim Keller's PowerPoint presentation on the impact of the Governor's proposed budget on the district.

NEW BUSINESS – CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM POLICY DAS and Governing Council have approved the policy. Vice President for Student Services Pat Griffin joined Governing Council to discuss questions about

it. Craig Blake, who helped write the policy, led the discussion. He reviewed the history of the policy. Its development took about a year. Recently there have been only minor changes. At our last meeting, we adopted the policy pretty much as written, except for changing “Academic Dishonesty” to “Cheating and Plagiarism: in its title. We also had some unanswered questions.

1) Should students be able to withdraw if given an F in the course before the drop date. There is inequity in students getting an irrevocable F for cheating on a final, but being able to withdraw to avoid an F for cheating on a midterm.

2) What happens when information goes to the office of the VPSS? Pat replied that whether or not information on cheating comes to her is the instructor’s choice. It goes to the Discipline Advisory Committee only at the instructor’s request, or at Pat’s initiative because of other information she has involving the same student.

Anne reported that because the English department is concerned that students might cheat in multiple classes, they proposed having their Division Dean keep information about student cheating, to give her a basis for recommending whether an instructor should fail a student in a course as a result of cheating. This is consistent with the policy we are discussing. Craig called for a uniform college policy, not subpolicies.

Pat said her office is the central place for disciplinary records. If an instructor chose to refer a matter to her, she would have a record, but if the instructor chose an academic sanction, she would not know. Is reporting done to refer a student for disciplinary action, or to inform Pat of an academic sanction without seeking further action. The reporting form could ask whether the faculty member wants Pat to consider further action. Craig said we do not want to dictate action to Student Services. We should send information to Pat’s office, for her to be aware of.

Jackie said students assigned F before the drop date have the right to know they can withdraw. Could a penalty grade for cheating override the college withdrawal deadline? If we can’t assign a penalty grade for cheating/plagiarism, we can state on the form that in addition to notifying the office, we are recommending disciplinary action.

Pat said the Discipline Advisory Committee would hear the situation and give her advice, but any action would be up to her. Craig pointed out that some faculty will recommend action, but others won’t, based on how much they know. Bernard said that’s why we mandate that the information go to Pat. Craig asked under what circumstances Pat would take action. Pat said she doesn’t know how many F’s are given for cheating, since she knows only of cases where faculty refer the student to her for discipline. Pat said for the student, the F is the penalty. It causes a significant interruption of educational progress. The academic sanction carries the weight. Craig said individual instructors can award F. The only case of a more severe sanction would be if the student is involved in cheating and plagiarism across the campus. Martha pointed out that several F’s for cheating will lead to probation for low GPA. Pat said if the instructor sends a request for college discipline, or if Pat detects multiple offenses, Pat would take it to the Discipline Advisory Committee.

Pat’s options range from a reprimand through a recommendation for expulsion from the District. The latter requires Board action. That has happened only once at CSM, under Alan Brown, in a case involving misallocation of funds.

Linda said it has been frustrating to know who is cheating but to have been unable to take action. Now we can send information to Pat. Pat said her action would depend on the evidence faculty present. If there’s a lot of information, it would bear looking into.

Jessica reported that ASCSM finds “cheating and plagiarism” too negative. They prefer “academic dishonesty.” In discussion, members said there should be no mistake about what the document is about. Cheating is cheating, and it is negative. A possible compromise: “Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism”

Jessica said a lot of students don’t know about the policy. Pat explained that as with similar policies, this one would go into the catalog and the faculty handbook, and students could also see the full text in the VPSS office. We are close to the deadline for the catalog. Members suggested changes to the text of the policy: Replace “social

security number” with “student ID number.” Restate the definition of plagiarism: “ ‘plagiarism’ means submitting work that is someone else’s as one’s own.” Add a line to the form so an instructor can make it clear whether additional discipline is being requested. Have a box for instructors to request the matter go to the committee. In effect say “Here’s the deal. What do you think?” Members asked is this going to be just a record for Pat’s knowledge. We hope if Pat sees enough cases with the same student, she would bring it to the committee. Then we have to trust the committee.

Rick noted that this is a working document, which can be amended in the future. Martha called for moving forward, making whatever changes are reasonable now. There is no place on the form to specify a request for disciplinary action. Bernard called for adding a line on the form like “I do/do not want further follow up. For information only/For possible college disciplinary action.” Governing Council accepted that suggestion by consensus. Tom thanked Pat for her participation.

NEW BUSINESS – STUDENT EQUITY PLAN Pat Griffin summarized the history of the Student Equity Plan (SEP.) In 1992 the Board of Governors asked each college to report progress or lack of it for groups of students. Colleges were asked to assemble data and report to the State Chancellor’s Office about such areas as access, retention, transfer rates, and completion, particularly for the handicapped, women, and ethnic minorities. In 1996, after Prop 209, colleges were asked to widen the focus of their reports, and this year the Board of Governors is directing community colleges to resubmit their SEPs, with focus on all students, not just particular groups. There is a new outline for the reports. Guidelines include showing development of increased access, retention, course completion, and transfer rates.

The good news is that all the information is available as MIS data uploaded to the State Chancellor’s Office. The data must be massaged and culled for the SEP. John Sewart has been involved with student equity, and knows what is needed. Each college must submit its report by July 1, 2004. The document needs to be developed primarily by the Academic Senate, and go to both College Council and the Board of Trustees. The actual work must be done between now and April, or early May at the latest. Pat suggested to Tom we continue with the original Student Equity Plan committee, whose co-chairs were Ruth Turner and Al Acena. It will be folded into the Student Development Committee. Tom has been contacting experienced committee members. Sylvia Aguirre and Ruth Turner have agreed to serve. Tom has four other faculty on the list. Tom has the electronic version of our current SEP for the committee to look at. John Sewart is prepared to help, with downloads from the Chancellor’s Office, including Modesto’s SEP. Modesto’s plan, like ours, was rated outstanding.

OLD BUSINESS – BUDGET AND PLANNING CALENDAR The legislative analyst’s review of the governor’s proposed budget may be out soon. The next big event will be the May revise. A tentative budget needs to be adopted by the Board of Trustees by June 23. After the May revise, Sacramento will discuss the state budget through August. There will be a public hearing Sept. 8, and the final adoption of the ’04-05 budget will be in September. There was no COLA in the original budget. There is now a verbal agreement for 1.84%. The District was anticipating becoming self-supporting (basic aid) in ’04-05. That would make projecting revenues and planning easier. However, there has been a lot of discussion at the state level of rolling Partnership for Excellence (PFE) money into general allocation, along with money for matriculation and for part-time salaries, office hours and benefits. That would raise our revenue target for becoming a basic aid district, and delay it for a few years.

The **District Committee on Budget and Finance** wants to improve communication about the budget. We are seeing that, for example in Jim Keller’s presentations at the three colleges’ budget committees. The committee’s work on an allocation model will take another year of work. Craig noted that only Canada is losing enrollment, but the colleges are not jockeying for position in enrollment. The enrollment model no longer rewards us, and most committee members do not see FTES as the fairest way to allocate money. There are other factors to consider.

Members raised several questions, which Rick will look into: Would a faculty salary increase (as opposed to, say, the cost of funding future retirements) be used as it was last year, as an excuse for layoffs? Our raise should not be on the backs of others. Has state COLA money been used to balance the District budget? Last year’s COLA? Because of no guarantee about this year’s? Were retirements considered in the estimate of salary increase costs?

NEW BUSINESS – STUDENT TUITION ASSISTANCE PLAN This is the fulfillment of a campaign promise made by new Trustee Dave Mandelkern. His intent is to provide tuition assistance to needy students, through donations from other students. When students register, they could check a box if they choose to make a donation to a fund administered by the Foundation and the college scholarship offices, to which other students could apply. A number of questions arose in discussion. Might the cost of administration exceed the amount donated? What staff will handle the money? What about students who drop out after getting assistance? Are donations tax deductible, and if so would we have to give students documentation of their donations? At this point the idea is conceptual, with not a lot in writing. The Chancellor has said there is no way to know whether it will pay off unless we try it. DAS, DSGC, and the Governing Councils will discuss the idea and provide feedback.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM REVIEW will be a high priority item at our next meeting. 35 programs have submitted reviews. Tom has a spreadsheet from Grace, with equipment and facilities requests to be discussed at the next deans' meeting. Tom will have information from that meeting at our Feb. 24 meeting.

:

OLD BUSINESS – UPDATE ON FACULTY COMPUTERS was tabled in John Hogan's absence. John is going through the application forms. Many of the requests were for upgrading existing systems. Many applicants expected us to do research on pricing. Fortunately, Annette Perot is on the committee and knows a lot about memory upgrades, printer options, and prices. Tom will meet with the committee.

OLD BUSINESS – DEGREE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS will be considered next time.

NEW BUSINESS – COLLEGE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE This committee is required for accreditation under the new standards. The committee's purpose is to monitor and examine outcomes assessment, which we must implement college-wide as well as at the departmental and division levels. It will meet monthly, and its work will be intense. With recommendations from Shirley and Grace, Tom has found two or three faculty members to serve, but more are needed. Martha suggested approaching the Learning Communities group at CSM. Assessment of student learning outcomes is a key part of the new standards. The committee will guide us through the process. Darlene Pacheco gave a presentation last week, and a workshop will be held at CSM at which faculty will modify their course outlines to incorporate student learning outcomes.

The new standards, ACCJC Standards Adopted 2002, are on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges website, www.accjc.org. Link to Evaluating Institutions under Core Documents and Publications. ASCCC has had problems with these standards and their implementation. How many departments should have classroom assessment done? What is a realistic three-year goal? Martha learned at the ASCCC Spring Plenary that lots of colleges had trouble trying to use the standards. Dr. Kelly is concerned about this as well. She and Pat Griffin are going to Palau on an accreditation visit using the new standards, and hope to learn more about using them. The College Assessment Committee is being assembled as leadership for the rest of us.

ANNOUNCEMENT Tom asked members to distribute flyers from @one (<http://one.evc.edu>), offering free online technology training for community college instructors.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m. The next meeting will be Feb. 24, 2003.