Committee on Excellence in Teaching

Meeting: 2/11/2015, 8:30-10:30am (called to order at 8:40am, adjourned at 10:30am)

Present: Laurel Franzen (Interim Chair), Nicole Bouvier-Brown, Chris Finlay, Dorothea Herreiner, Olga Moraga, Beth Serlin, Brad Stone

Agenda

1. Review of last meeting’s minutes
2. Complete Scope Statement for Proposed Policy for the new Honor Code
3. Update Honor Code document to incorporate comments received from the Faculty Senate
4. Draft proposal to create a CTE advisory board
6. Other CTE announcements & issues
7. Remaining Spring meetings need to be scheduled – Mon or Wed (8:30-10:30 am) has worked somewhat this semester...

Minutes

Preliminary Points:

Agenda points 2 and 3 need to be swapped. Both points ended up being discussed jointly.

Report: The Teaching Evaluation Waiver was passed by electronic vote. The AAPC Scope Statement for this needs to be filled in (the form and accompanying process did not exist when the waiver was first discussed).

Review of last meeting’s minutes

Move to adopt the passage in the minutes from the 1/26 meeting about ex-officio voting rights as discussed at last meeting, which was passed unanimously.

Update Honor Code document to incorporate comments received from the Faculty Senate

Complete Scope Statement for Proposed Policy for the new Honor Code

Report from Senate Discussion (1/29) by Laurel Franzen:

- Timeline has been slowed down, since the Honor Code will not be included in the Bulletin for the next Academic Year (2014-15); Senate asks for this matter to receive careful consideration and should not be rushed.
- Senate asks for CET to incorporate suggestions and present a final version.
- Senate asks for legal counsel to review the Honor Code, although it is not clear at what step.
- Senate asks for Associate Deans to weigh in.
- Senate asks for Honor Code by synched with Community Standards
- Written feedback has been received only from Elizabeth Drummond
- Most discussion during the Senate meeting focused on the section on Instructor Protections and the two early passages extending the policy to all members of the LMU community
Several of these suggestions are not clear to the CET – therefore the suggestion for Laurel to take the following questions back to the Senate at its next meeting:

- Given that the Honors Code is one section of the Community Standards, wouldn’t the new Honor Code replace that old Honor Code in the Community Standards? In what other sense or in relation to what specific policy, either in substance or structure, is a synching required given that Judicial Affairs process is a separate process and an Academic Honor Code process should be decided by academics?
- Do we have all input from the Senate that we should take into account? If not, we would like to have all such suggestions, concerns, and questions by 2/23, in particular, any comprehensive comments from the whole Senate, if applicable.
- Does it make sense to fill in the AAPC Scope Statement if rewriting of the Honor Code has been going on for over 2 years, and a Task Force had been formed with a specific charge (see top of Honor Code Draft, Jan 22, 2014)? That charge also identifies the CET role – is that identification of the role still valid or has it been expanded? Shouldn’t the Senate be filling in that form, if it is appropriate to be used for a process that has been ongoing for a long time (and where questions, such as 4, suggest future development of the policy)?
- Should we consult with Associate Dean and others although a representative of the Associate Deans, the Registrar, and the Dean of Student Affairs were members of the Task Force that put together the draft the is the basis for the current work of the CET?
- When should we consult the Associate Deans, if at all separately (see above), and Legal Counsel? Who else needs to be consulted? Should they be consulted at the same time or sequentially, and if the latter, in what order? After we have put together a final proposal or should it go back to the Senate first? Or should we get input from Legal Counsel on some points before put a final draft together? (which points? when?)
- Does the Senate suggest that we completely strike all faculty protections (section E), or should we adapt them based on the comments we have received? (this is not asking about the application of the code to all LMU community members as included in I.A. and I.B.)
- Do we need an Honor Code for the rest of the community if expectations of academic honesty do not include faculty and staff?

During a discussion about the appropriateness to include Instructor Protections in the document the following main points were raised:

- LMU needs a cultural shift that involves all, not just targeted at students.
- Not having instructor protections in such a document is what makes instructors vulnerable, not having them there – then we continue what we had so far where some follow the rules and stick their necks out and others don’t; that makes those implementing strict academic honesty standards much more vulnerable.
- Stating that “instructors are expected to consistently apply academic integrity standards” is a procedural statement and a necessary aspect for the policy which otherwise has no bite.
- It is not clear why faculty cannot be compelled to consistently apply strict standards of academic honesty, a key area of the academic endeavor LMU stands for, as they are compelled on other policies.
- The policy cannot focus just on the procedural aspects of the appeals process – it needs to identify substantive aspects.

Points 4-7 (no point 5) were not discussed.

Minutes submitted by Dorothea Herreiner.