CET Meeting  
Friday, November 14, 2014  
VDA 236

Present: Wendy Binder, Chris Finlay, Laurel Franzen, Dorothea Herreiner, Beth Serlin, Brad Stone

Absent: Olga Moraga

1. The minutes from the October 17th meeting were approved.
2. Announcements
   a. Laurel agreed to chair the CET while Wendy is on sabbatical.
   b. Nicole Bouvier-Brown will serve on the CET and represent CSE while Wendy is on sabbatical during the spring of 2015.
   c. Wendy will send an email to Jennifer Pate, the President of the Faculty Senate, to ask for an update in regards to the Faculty Awards Committee and the Burns Award this year
   d. Wendy is scheduled to meet with the Academic Affairs Policy Committee. Wendy will report back to the CET with updates.
   e. Dorothea is not going to be on sabbatical in the spring.
3. CET discussed the Travel Grant applications.
   a. Kelly Younger’s application
      i. It is unclear what is considered teaching-related in his proposal.
      ii. It was suggested for CET to promote faculty to go to conference and present teaching topics.
      iii. CET approved Kelly Younger’s travel grant application (with stipulations – Offer workshop on how to use acting and drama in teaching at large, in particular, in subject areas far removed from those typically including it; this could be a forum for sharing the worksheets, or as summary of the worksheets he mentions but should not be limited to it.)
   b. Jeff Phillips.
      i. CET approved Jeff Phillips’ travel grant application.
   c. Vince Coletta
      i. CET approved Vince Coletta’s travel grant application for the earlier trip.
      ii. For the later trip, his application will be considered in April only if there are funds available at that point.
      iii. On both applications – meals will not be covered.
   d. Lisa Mueller
      i. Lisa Mueller is a visiting faculty member.
      ii. CET approved Lisa Mueller’s travel grant application (with stipulations – Hold workshop at the CTE that brings together people from different fields (social sciences and beyond) that teach research methods.)
   e. Paul Monson
      i. Paul Monson is a visiting faculty member.
ii. Since he is planning on presenting his paper on teaching at the discipline-based conference, the travel request is teaching related.

iii. CET approved Paul Monson’s travel grant application (with stipulations and within the limits of the grant – Share the results in a CTE workshop, possibly in addition to the departmental venue, focusing on general lessons her learnt, such as the role of Vatican II for education, or the use of history and narrative on teaching, or TBD.)

f. Vince Coletta
   i. Vince Coletta did submit a travel application for next summer. However, CET accepts travel grant applications only for the current academic year, as was clearly communicated to Vince
   ii. CET decided to implement an additional deadline in mid-April (subject to available funding) for summer grants (about two to three awards maximum). The grants will be awarded in April and paid out in the next academic year.
      1. There would need to be a stipulation with the new deadline that would state that the payment would have to be coordinated with the CTE.
   iii. Vince Coletta’s travel grant application will be reviewed in April 2015.

4. CET discussed the honor code document submitted by the Ad Hoc Honor Code Task Force.
   a. Within the Policy and General Information section, it was suggested to change the language within the paragraph to the following: “Students The LMU community are is responsible for understanding the standards of academic honesty. Students are responsible for determining how they apply to their academic work and behavior and for contacting their instructor(s) to resolve any questions.”
   b. Comments regarding the Definitions of Academic Honesty and Dishonesty section:
      i. 2) B. There was a comment to include the use of technology as an example.
      ii. 4) B. Proprietary information needs to be defined. The document should specify what constitutes course resources and materials (knowledge is free and available).
         1. The language used in 4) B. should be used uniformly throughout point four.
      iii. 4) C. There was a question as to whether prior exams are included in this statement. Is it having, using, or sharing material that is the problem?
   c. Comments regarding the Additional Definitions section:
      i. 10) Faculty do not have supervisors in the narrow sense of the word. It was suggested to change the language to reflect that faculty contact their respective program director/department chair, otherwise a supervisor.
   d. Comments regarding the Student Protections section:
      i. 4) Some CET members feel that the offense should stay on the students’ records. As long as the student wants to apply for a degree, the offense should stay on one’s record.
   e. Comments from the Process section:
      i. The document does not protect faculty from possible consequences of reporting. Professors’ course evaluations and reputations can suffer due to reporting.
   f. Comments from the Documentation: Files and Records section:
      i. There was a discussion about whether faculty should know about (the number of) previous offenses.
g. The flow chart does not include all of the information stated in the document.
h. Wendy will summarize the comments from the Honor Code discussion and circulate to the CET.

5. Next Meeting: Friday, December 5, 1:30-3:30pm in VDA 236.