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MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions and Note Taker
   1. Happy to have everyone in person as well as on the phone
   2. Introductions: Dolores, Tanya, Jason, Lilian, Olivia, Julie, Wheeler, Cynthia, and Corinna
   3. Corinna will happily take notes
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Discussion items, with action as needed
   * 1. Set calendar for remaining meetings
        1. Unofficial dinner meeting at plenary
        2. May not have an opportunity to meet in November after plenary
        3. No December Exec Board Meeting but will need to get something to Exec for Jan or Feb
        4. 4 Dec. 2015 from 1:00-2:00 p.m. will be our next phone meeting
        5. In Jan., we can meet during the Instructional Design Institute on the 21st-23rd that will be held in Riverside.
        6. 12 Feb. 2016 from 10:00-11:30 a.m. phone conference
        7. 25 March 2016 from 11:00-12:30 a.m. phone conference
        8. 13 May 2016 from 10:00-11:30 a.m. phone conference (as necessary)
     2. Dual Enrollment Document (13.02, F14): Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges compile and communicate guidance which identifies pertinent regulations and effective practices and clarifies terminology regarding the enrollment of high school students in college courses and publish this guidance by the end of Fall 2015.
        1. What format should this take?
           1. This document is morphing as we speak. Unclear what type of document this should be—In the past, we have taken document to mean paper. In this case, this is a fluid idea, so it will be difficult to write a paper on it.
        2. Wait for RP Group or not?
           1. The Research Professionals (RP) group is working on a toolbox for this, but the deadline has been pushed back, so we don’t know when it will be ready.
           2. Spoke with David and John F. to see if we should wait for this group.
           3. Seems to have been decided for us—we were supposed to present the document at fall plenary--
        3. If not, can we produce an outline for the January Exec meeting of what we want this document to cover?
           1. Do we want a paper, effective practices document, or a white paper?
           2. Probably not a formally adopted paper because it might change as we move forward.
           3. We need to be cognoscente of the Chancellor’s Office and their perspective—is it on legal’s radar (yes)—are they pushing out any guidelines for this? Title 3 language might need to be revised. Difficult to get folks to respond to email because they are so swamped
           4. We produce guidelines in web format with opinion recognizing the gray areas.
           5. We can identify the issues so that local colleges can discuss for selves
           6. Produce a guideline document that will morph with identified areas in need of additional clarification that might look more like an FAQ. We don’t want to overstate things.
           7. There is wonkiness of waitlist classes—a part of the bill won’t work, so we my come up with a wild interpretation of it. Also problem with defining registered.
           8. Do we create a document that is largely an FAQ to provide information to the field of what we know: examples of good dual enrollment practices—other ideas that have been covered in previous breakouts. Then problems with wait list. Have it go to Exec—nothing with the word paper—more like a white paper—quasi-narrative FAQ—but not a paper.
           9. If we do it this way, will it be helpful for the field? What do senate presidents need to know in order to put on the breaks when necessary and to assist the process when necessary? We’re also helping to frame the conversation that will help forge policy.
           10. Get this completed in the next two or so months.
           11. Wheeler will throw out a list of content with the stuff that we know and the stuff that we know about. He will provide an intro-background paragraph to contextualize things, including those things that we know, those things we don’t know, and those things that we would like to remain in the gray area.
           12. Cynthia, Lilian, Dolores, and John F. will be presenting on this topic, which will help to inform the content of the FAQ+ document that we’ll be creating.
           13. Lilian is willing to do some research on this as well. Santa Barbara is a college to consider, but we may not want to model them system wide.
           14. Olivia mentioned that San Diego Mira Mar College also engages in dual enrollment.
           15. Dolores will speak with Vince to let him know what we’re compiling.
           16. Let’s have it in for the Jan. 17th meeting
     3. Breakout at plenary
        1. Board Policies and Academic Senates breakout
           1. Colleges, in some cases, are taking the templates and implementing them with no discussion with faculty—and using them for curricular processes. A number of places where it would be easy to stick in someone other than senate president.
           2. Suggested to have someone from the league come and dialog about this, and Jane Wright will join us.
           3. The session will have Dolores facilitating
           4. Wheeler will discuss how it isn’t working as well as it ought.
           5. Jason, John, and Corinna will share how it is going well—they types of dialog that is going on as it ought to be.
           6. Corinna put together the PowerPoint based upon committee input and ran the group through it, and the group revised as necessary.
           7. First few slides be Dolores
           8. Four slides will be Jane Wright
           9. See notes in presentation for further discussion about the breakout.
     4. IDI breakouts (January 21, 2016 to January 23, 2016 at the Riverside Convention Center): Need to presentations—things that haven’t been presented at other events—if there is something else that a group would like to bring forward, there is still room to consider additional innovations.
        1. Academic Integrity
           1. Began this conversation at our first meeting. Discussed ways to change things in order to accentuate the positive rather than being punitive.
           2. Finalizing the IDI program that is going to Exec this Wednesday.
           3. May have an additional civil engagement breakout—but may not have room for it. May be some areas—need more CTE stuff—civil engagement with CTE connection could be excellent.
           4. Civil engagement, social justice, and public safety could be something incredibly worthwhile to discuss
           5. Cynthia will speak to the people in departments at her college and maybe consult with De Anza College to see if they might have something.
           6. Cynthia, Corinna, and Wheeler will present on this
           7. We wanted to showcase examples about how we change from a punitive—don’t cheat because you’ll get failed to don’t cheat because we don’t do that here
           8. We want to teach how to value learning—that is the focus—How do we teach/encourage students to value learning? How do we teach this?
           9. Foothill switched this around and went from punitive to positive.
           10. Can we link this to equity? Some people never learned how to not plagiarize—International students are not clear on rules—how do we educate students before even going to class—Foothill does something with integrity during a student orientation—and it was well received by students. Different cultures are used to a collaborative coursework model and don’t understand that they are not supposed to collaborate on their papers—in Russia, it is all about the collective, so they don’t cite.
           11. As facilitators, we should define academic integrity at the beginning—we can also provide the agreed upon assumption that there is a problem related to academic integrity at the onset of the breakout—briefly—so as to allow for the discussion of strategies that we’d like to have.
           12. How do we help students understand expectations related to academic integrity?
           13. Have to have a cultural conversation—but be careful that we don’t fall into hasty generalizations or stereotyping—
           14. A cultural mindset: cheat to get a leg up—not a particular group—sometimes the shortcut can cost lives.
           15. Do we want a PPT, or do we want to approach this in a different way
           16. Do we want to encourage small group discussion with poster boarding to get the discussion going?
           17. Let’s create some strategies—have something that attendees can walk away with and take back to their colleges.
           18. Individual, Classroom, Departments, Division, & College-wide, and how do we institutionalize
           19. Identify one strategy from each level that you will commit to implementing at your college—maybe give them a card upon which to write their commitment
           20. Have presenters work a poster board and lead the group there in discussion of the topic.
           21. It is up to us to create college environment in which we expect adult behaviors from adult students.
           22. How can we encourage student mentoring with this topic? How can students teach other students to behave with integrity?
           23. In an age of the Internet with everything being everywhere, so lines of integrity are further blurred.
           24. Don’t most colleges have college learning outcomes related to integrity?
           25. How do we allow for the grace to let the students learn while also enforcing the policies? How do we strike the balance?
           26. Value thrust—but also how to be savvy—how does a student just out of high school know college academic expectations and standards?
           27. Not coming to class prepared for group work could also be included in academic integrity
           28. How do we deal with those students who may use mental illness and emotional and psychological distress as a tool to manipulate a situation?
           29. We don’t want to end up in the mental health discussion—we should simply admit that we need to seek help and assist students with attaining help.
           30. Groups of three move from poster board to poster board—provide what they are doing, what they’d like to do, what they imagine they might do—questions that they might have.
        2. Global Citizenship (with Leg and Advocacy Committee)
           1. Cross pollination of the two committees that will address this topic
           2. Pulled together a description but haven’t begun planning yet
           3. Integrate global citizenship consciousness into classes without changing curriculum. Might have a second breakout for CTE faculty—and fifteen minutes in the general session.
           4. We can fit in academic integrity with this as well.
           5. Possible gaps in the program: sessions for part time faculty and for CTE faculty.
           6. Share any ideas for additional sessions with Dolores this weekend.
           7. Everyone needs to register for this event sooner rather than later.
     5. Cross Pollination with other committees; ideas, suggestions?
        1. Anything that we want to do that we aren’t?
        2. We will do something with curriculum.
        3. We may get a number of resolutions to work with after plenary.
   1. Review of status of assigned resolutions –updated from August Executive Committee meeting
      1. 7.01 and 14.01 (S15): Academic Dishonesty
         1. 7.01: Develop a handbook of effective practices—a lot of this will come out of the IDI breakout. The IDI breakout could inform the survey—then create a survey for the field that combined would inform a handbook. Some effective practices are fairly obvious. For the legal portions, we need consult with the Chancellor’s Office. What mechanisms are in place to assure that students aren’t falsely accused? We may want to address this as well when we create this handbook. Might not need to if we focus on the culture and perspective change.
         2. 14.01: This has to go to the System Advisory Committee (SAC) because of the Title 5 change. However, does it have to be a Title 5 change? Even if it doesn’t, we have to move forward with this because the body passed this resolution. The Title 5 change will help faculty to enforce this on a local level. The registrar is the keeper of the grade. Faculty are not allowed to assign an RD—the resolution allows for faculty to assign RD as a grade as faculty assign grades. What happens when a faculty member is still working through an integrity violation at the time of grade submissions? Dolores will ask Eric Shearer to put this on the next SAC agenda. Dolores will speak to Freitas to clarify intent of the resolution.
      2. 17.01 (F12): Approval of Grant Driven Projects
         1. The survey was sent out, but Dolores has not seen the results. What are the consequences of grants? What processes do colleges have? The Workforce Task Force (WTF) discussed this previously. Dolores will check-in with Freitas about the survey results. This is local—look at results—and see if we can provide guidelines for spring plenary to bring this back forward and take care of it because it still remains an issue. We can provide the areas about which faculty should be aware as well as best practices.
      3. 13.20 (F11): Supplemental Instruction Survey and Glossary
         1. Working with a few groups and awaiting the results. As soon as we have them, we can begin working on this one. We are shooting to finish this by fall 2016.
   2. Other?
      1. Resolutions for fall plenary?
         1. Too late. If something comes up, we can put forward resolutions as individuals or from colleges through individuals.
         2. Wheeler is working on a resolution related to the Doing What Matters Campaign. Identifies a huge equity issue. Where is the process whereby decisions made get evaluated? We have Chancellor Office programs operating—but as stakeholders, how do we evaluate them? Why aren’t we doing the same thing as the fifteen sectors used by the rest of the world? This body should consider the important narratives so that we can drive the change.
         3. With respect to part-time faculty issues, we have a lot of information but have not shown much action taken upon that information. How do we get the policy narrative back on the radar? Not going to answer this overnight—maybe not even in our lifetime. What sort of policy should we consider as related to part-time faculty? Review 2002 paper that really addresses key components (separate from bargaining components) of this issue. The part-time faculty committee should address the paper/identify the issues and figure out the recommendation that they would want to take to Exec who would—then send it to Ed Pol—and then we can see how it might relate to legislation. Maybe this looks like a position brief. Need to be aware of the union/senate overlap and need to make sure that we stay in an academic and professional place. In the past, it has been difficult to steer folks away from the compensation pitfall—we need to stay with a 40,000 foot or higher view that stays with academic and professional matters. Could go a Board of Governors route; we don’t have to stay with a legislative route.
      2. Rostrum Articles
         1. Write up something after Board Policy and Dual Enrollment breakouts.
      3. Bring a recommendation to Exec about an “in between” place: Where we have inferred positions but not straightforwardly taken a position—Should this committee be the place to find and house different “best practices” and varying levels of policy that is easily accessible to local senates. White papers, some rostrum articles, FAQs would all fall in this “in between” category. This allows for a place for those items that are more fluid and change frequently—would have the approval of Exec and would be easier to change than an entire vote on a paper would be. There is weight behind it; it goes through Exec before being recommended. Create a middle group of academic advisory documents and best practices that the field can use at will. The Educational Policies Committee seems to be the logical group that would compile, revise, and update this information as necessary. Committees would be bringing items forward—they don’t just come from Exec. Maybe we hire someone to review all of the past papers to uncover some of these “in between” ideas/suggestions/best practices/guidelines. We will need to be clear on messaging to the field.
5. Events:
   1. Executive Committee – November 4, Marriott Irvine
   2. \*Fall Plenary – November 5-7, Marriott Irvine
   3. Curriculum Regional (North) – November 13, Solano College
   4. Curriculum Regional (South) – November 14, Mt. San Antonio College
   5. Instructional Design and Innovation – January 21-23, Riverside Convention Center
6. Other?
7. Adjournment