Members present: Laurel Franzen, Dorothea Herreiner, Brad Stone, Beth Serlin, Olga Moraga

Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

Minutes from last meeting read and approved.

Agenda Items:

I. Honor Code document: Discussed processes of presenting the Honor Code to the Faculty Senate. Laurel (Acting chair)

Records and files: Discussed inconsistency of terms used with of records and files within the Honor Code Document. Files as documentary evidence, record is a

Added definitions of records and files: Section C, number 14:

Record: permanent documentation kept by a University concerning the student’s matriculation and performance at Loyola Marymount University.

File: documentary evidence kept by the University concerning the student’s academic violation

After discussing adding new definitions, committee decided to submit document as is for the feedback to the Faculty Senate.

Laurel will send document to Franca and request to attend meeting of Faculty Senate on Jan. 29 to provide context for a more formal presentation at the February meeting.

Request to move forward with document as is and for document to be open for revision on an annual year or every two years.
II. Student course evaluation waiver

Committee discussed draft of waiver policy
Timeline of submission and approval of Dean was discussed.
Document will go through CET then AAPC then Senate before going to then PROVOST. Formal paperwork/document will need to be submitted. Discussion ensued as to the protocol of submitting policy document.

Change was made in regards to alternate student evaluations and how students will provide feedback.

Committee decided to review waiver and send Laurel their vote to approve the document.

Question was raised as to whether Dorothea’s vote counts.
The last review of the bylaws in the AY 2013-14 was suspended when the discussion about splitting the CET into a Teaching Committee and a CTE Advisory Board emerged mid academic year; the current bylaws are the ones in place prior to that discussion (e.g. listing 8 members of the committee, although the Senate has by now reduced this to 6 members).
It was argued, that, provided that the existing bylaws do not further qualify the status of ex-officio members (the CTE Director), that the CTE Director does not have any voting rights elsewhere in the decision process, and that no LMU-wide written rules about ex-officio members are known, the CTE will “suspend rules” according to Robert’s Rule of Order (see discussion 11.st edition of Robert’s Rule of Order, pages 483-484 for the relevant discussion of the role of ex-officio members) and let the CTE Director vote until the bylaws are changed. This issue should be clarified when the charge and composition of CET is being reviewed by the Senate.

III. Advisory Board

- This item was not discussed

Meeting adjourned at 10:30

Minutes respectfully submitted by Olga Moraga