



# College of the Canyons Academic Senate

November 14, 2024

3:00 p.m. to 4:50 p.m.

Hybrid Format, via Zoom & in-person in BONH 330

## Join Zoom Meeting

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/83788078102?pwd=B3bKUsRrA4wOCQggKayblQ9r7Hqa63.1>

Meeting ID: 837 8807 8102; Passcode: 834823

One tap mobile +16694449171 US +17193594580 US

**Additional Teleconferencing locations can be found on page 2 of this agenda.**

## AGENDA

**Notification:** *The meetings may be audio recorded for note taking purposes. These recordings are deleted once the meeting summary is approved by the Academic Senate.*

**ADA statement:** If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Senate Office at [academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu](mailto:academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu) College of the Canyons

### A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
  - *This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Academic Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Public questions or comments can be submitted via email at [academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu](mailto:academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu) or asked via zoom chat feature.*
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Committee Appointments:
  - Honors Committee appointments:
    - Alejandro Lichtscheidl, Chemistry, (MSE)
    - Hind Ali, Chemistry, (MSE)
5. Sub-Committee Summaries
  - Senate Executive Committee meeting summary, October 28, 2024 (pg. 6-7)
6. Approval of the Consent Calendar

Academic Senate Summary, October 31, 2024 (pg. 3-5)	<a href="#">Curriculum Committee Summary, November 7, 2024</a>
--	--

### B. Reports

*These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.*

1. Curriculum Committee Annual Chair Report, Tricia George (pg. 8-12)
2. Academic Senate Presidents Report, Lisa Hooper
3. Vice President Report, Garrett Rieck

### C. Action Items

Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

*None*

#### **D. Discussion**

*Below are items that the Senate will discuss, and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

1. Academic Freedom: Conditional Report on Grading, Karyl Kicenski (pg. 13-19)
2. [Local GE Changes](#), Tricia George
3. Pre-requisite Satisfaction, Steve Erwin & Dr. Jasmine Ruys
4. Open Class Status, Steve Erwin & Lisa Sawyer
5. Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) Procedures, Shane Ramey (pg. 20-22)

#### **E. Unfinished Business**

*Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.*

1. Web Design/Server Update
2. Artificial Intelligence Resolution

#### **F. New Future Business**

*Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.*

1. Tenure Committee Training Workshops
2. Department Chair Training Schedule
3. Back up training for administrative support staff
4. Department Chair Election Procedures
5. Pre-requisite Satisfaction
6. Open Class Status
7. CANVAS/Turnitin Integration
8. Academic Freedom & Course Outline of Record

#### **G. Announcements**

1. Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates Fall 2024: Dec. 5<sup>th</sup>. Spring 2025: Feb. 13<sup>th</sup>, Feb. 27<sup>th</sup>, March 13<sup>th</sup>, March 27<sup>th</sup>, April 17<sup>th</sup>, May 1<sup>st</sup> & May 15<sup>th</sup>
2. [2025 ASCCC Spring Plenary](#): April 24 – 26<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Irvine, CA.
3. [2025 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session](#): Nov. 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>, Regency La Jolla, San Diego, CA.
4. [2025 ASCCC Curriculum Institute](#): July 9<sup>th</sup>- 12<sup>th</sup>, Ontario Convention Center, Ontario, CA.
5. [2025 ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute](#): June 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, San Francisco Airport, CA.

#### **H. Adjournment**

---

The teleconference is accessible through the following link:

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/83788078102?pwd=B3bKUsRrA4wOCQggKayblQ9r7Hqa63.1>

**Please note:**

**This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom**  
*none*

## Academic Senate Meeting Summary for October 31, 2024

Voting Members					
Senate President	Lisa Hooper	X	Business Senator	<i>David Brill proxy for Gary Quire</i>	X
Vice President	Garrett Rieck	X	Learning Resources Senator	Jennifer Thompson	X
Curriculum Chair	Tricia George	X	Personal & Professional Learning Senator	Garrett Rieck	X
Policy Review Chair	Nicole Faudree	X	Public Safety	VACANT	
Communications Officer	Erica Seubert	X	At Large Senator	<i>Shane Ramey proxy for Sab Matsumoto</i>	X
AT Senator	Regina Blasberg	X	At Large Senator	Michelle LaBrie	X
MSHP-MSE Senator	Thomas Gisel	X	At Large Senator	Rebecca Shepherd	X
MSHP-HPPS Senator	Lak Dhillon	X	At Large Senator	Shane Ramey	X
VAPA Senator	David Brill	X	At Large Senator	Nadia Monosov	X
Student Services Senator	Jesse Vera	X	Adjunct Senator	Todd Fatta	X
Humanities Senator	Mike Harutunian	X	Adjunct Senator	Lauren Rome	X
Kinesiology/Athletics Senator	Leora Gabay	X	Adjunct Senator	Linda Beauregard-Vasquez	X
SBS Senator	Jennifer Paris	X	X= Present	A= Absent	

Non-voting Members			
Dr. Omar Torres (via Zoom)	X	Paul Wickline	X
Marilyn Jimenez	X	Jason Burgdorfer (COCFA President)	A
Dan Portillo (AFT President) (via Zoom)	A	ASG Student Representative Jesus Martinez (ASG) (via Zoom) & Sanjana Sudhir (ASG) (via Zoom)	X

Guest							
Alexa Dimakos	X	Dr. Daylene Meuschke	X	Jennifer Brezina	X	Sarah Ethridge	X
Anzhela Grigoryan	X	Dianna Avery	X	Karyl Kicenski	X		
Cassidy Butow	X	Erin Delaney	X	Michael Felix	X		
Chad Peters	X	Dr. Jasmine Ruys	X	Nadia Cotti	X		

### A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 3:06pm
2. Public Comment: none
3. Approval of the Agenda:
  - Motion to approve the agenda by Regina, seconded by Todd Fatt. Shane Ramey proxy for Sab Matsumoto (yes, vote). David Brill proxy for Gary Quire (yes, vote). Unanimous. Approved.
4. Committee Appointments:
  - Hiring Committee list (pg. 3)
    - Lisa Hooper was not included in the original list on page. 3. Lisa will be added.
5. Sub-Committee Summaries: none

6. Approval of the Consent Calendar

- Motion to approve the agenda by Michelle seconded by Regina. Shane Ramey proxy for Sab Matsumoto (yes, vote). David Brill proxy for Gary Quire (yes, vote). Unanimous. Approved.

Academic Senate Summary, October 17, 2024  
(pg. 4-7)

[Curriculum Committee Summary](#), October 24, 2024

B. Reports

*These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.*

1. Academic Integrity Committee Annual Chair Report, Shane Ramey (pg. 8-10)

- The committee has been focusing on Artificial Intelligence. The committee will be collaborating with the Policy Committee to review the student conduct policies regarding alleged misconduct. There is a need for a best practices sheet.  
The committee will be bringing forward new committee procedures and an AI statement. Shane will attend the ASCCC AI conference in San Diego. If anyone is interested in joining the committee let Shane know.

2. Academic Senate Presidents Report, Lisa Hooper

- **Academic Senate Agenda Documents Deadlines:** A reminder was shared to submit all agenda documents to Marilyn by the Friday of the week before the meeting.
  - **Common Course Numbering (CNN):** Violeta was selected from Math Dept. Phase 3 will start soon. Please pay attention to emails from Tricia George, Curriculum Chair, regarding courses in upcoming phases of implementation of this initiative and associated opportunities to participate.
  - **Curriculum Conference:** There is a great deal happening in response to legislative mandates. Lisa attended the Area C meeting, as did 8 other faculty members.
  - **Fall Plenary:** An ASCCC Resolution packet will be presented at the ASCCC Fall 24 plenary. There will be a resolution on the syllabus and what information should be included. Lisa will share the resolution packet.
  - **Senate Executive Committee Update:** A proposed new governance structure including how Senate committees inform decision-making at COC. Senate committee composition (representatives from each school/division or team of interested faculty) were discussed.
  - **Adjunct offices:** The Bonelli adjunct offices will be outfitted for Zoom and more headphones were installed. IT is working on finding a room in the UCEN for adjuncts to use.
  - **Pricilla Benitez, Director of Mental Health Services:** Faculty/Senate appreciate her email on election stress.
  - **Faculty Appreciation:** Students are being impacted positively by faculty and appreciate what faculty does to help them; they appreciate knowing us and being in our learning environments.
3. Vice Presidents Report, Garrett Rieck
- **Office Lottery 1 Round:** The office lottery is run by the Academic Senate. The Vice President, Garrett Rieck will help with office moves. One office lottery round will be run in fall and one in the spring. Faculty who participates in the lottery will be required to move offices in January. Any request for new furniture or ergonomic assessments can be forwarded to the Senate.

C. Action Items

Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

None

D. Discussion

*Below are items that the Senate will discuss, and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

*Note: The discussion item list was re-ordered to accommodate presenters. Item #2 was presented first, and item #1 was presented second.*

1. [Academic Freedom Committee Report-Grading](#), Karyl Kicenski (pg. 11-17)
  - a. Should faculty assign a zero as a grade to a student who completed an assignment using AI? There is some disagreement over how to address the issue. There is some tension between the law and academic freedom. The student code of conduct hasn't been reviewed since 2018. The supreme court states that students are entitled to due process, but this has not been explained in detail. The current penalty is to bring matters of plagiarism to the Dean of Students Services or designee. The report offers suggestions for how to handle plagiarism and ensures faculty are involved. Lauren Rome's name will be added to the report as it was inadvertently excluded from this conditional report.
1. [Curriculum Local GE Pattern](#), Tricia George & Jesse Vera
  - a. Title V was changed to have the GE areas of our local degrees match the GE areas of competencies. All local CTE degree (45 programs) were pulled to determine which exceeded the 60-unit requirement. Could a waiver for high unit majors be considered? The committee voted in October and narrowed it down to 3 models (A, B & C). The categories are defined by Title 5 but there is local control over to how define these. Students can complete an SBS or diversity requirement. The local model that the curriculum committee is recommending was shared. There are three ways to satisfy the local GE, one is to locally decide on the requirements, have students choose the CALGETC path or obtain a bachelor's degree. A final model will be selected. The new model will be enacted by fall 2025. This item will return for further discussion.

#### **E. Unfinished Business**

*Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.*

1. Web Design/Server Update
2. Artificial Intelligence Resolution

#### **F. New Future Business**

*Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.*

1. Tenure Committee Training Workshops
2. Department Chair Training Schedule
3. Back up training for administrative support staff
4. Department Chair Election Procedures
5. Pre-requisite Satisfaction
6. Open Class Status
7. CANVAS/Turnitin Integration
8. Academic Freedom & Course Outline of Record

#### **G. Announcements**

- Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates Fall 2024: Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> & Dec. 5<sup>th</sup>. Spring 2025: Feb. 13<sup>th</sup>, Feb. 27<sup>th</sup>, March 13<sup>th</sup>, March 27<sup>th</sup>, April 17<sup>th</sup>, May 1<sup>st</sup> & May 15<sup>th</sup>
- 2024 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session: Nov. 7<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup>, Visalia Convention Center, Visalia, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Spring Plenary: April 24 – 26<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Irvine, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session: Nov. 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>, Regency La Jolla, San Diego, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Curriculum Institute: July 9<sup>th</sup>- 12<sup>th</sup>, Ontario Convention Center, Ontario, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute: June 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, San Francisco Airport, CA.

#### **H. Adjournment:** 4:50 pm.

The teleconference is accessible through the following link:

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/83788078102?pwd=B3bKUsRrA4wOCQggKaybIQ9r7Hqa63.1>

**Please note:**

**This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom**



COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**October 28, 2024**  
9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., Via Zoom

## Summary

Attendees: Alisha Kaminsky, Chase Dimock, Dustin Silva, Gary Quire, Jesse Vera, Julie Johnson, Linda Beauregard-Vasquez, Lisa Hooper, Marilyn Jimenez, Nicole Faudree, Patty Robinson, Shane Ramey and Tricia George

### A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 9:35 am
2. Public Comment:
  - I. The Grand Opening for BONH 330 is scheduled for Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> from 2:00pm – 3:00pm. The event will take place right before the Academic Senate meeting.
3. Approval of the Agenda
  - I. Discussion item #2 was moved to #1 to accommodate the presenter's schedule.
  - II. Motion to approve the agenda by Jesse Vera, seconded by Alisha Kaminsky. Unanimous. Approved.

### B. Consent Calendar

1. Adoption of September 30, 2024, Senate Executive Committee Summary (pg. 3-5)
  - I. Motion to approve the summary by Lisa Hooper, seconded by Alisha Kaminsky. Nicole has abstained. Unanimous. Approved.

### C. Roles and Responsibilities of the Executive Senate

### D. Action:

*None*

### E. Discussion

1. Academic Senate Sub-Committee Membership Composition
  - I. **Committee Composition, Vacancies and Procedures:** A discussion took place with various committee chairs to discuss committee composition and vacancies. In addition, discussion took place to determine if certain committees should include equal representation from various schools/departments or could faculty join if they have an interest. Garrett will discuss with Lisa how committee vacancies should be managed. Could there be a revitalization process for committee composition? There are currently eighty committees on campus, could some committees be merged with other committees? Some committees are in the process of developing operating procedures while others need to update their procedures.
  - II. **Goal of the Senate Executive Committee:** To goal of the Executive Committee is to make sure that committee members have a way to communicate to the Senate concerns, needs and anything which may be important to their committee work. Some committees work best with a smaller group composition with clearly defined goals.
2. New district Governance Structure: Instructional, Operational & Executive Council
  - I. **Re-Structuring Governance Model:** A new governance model is being discussed which could

inform how the committees do their work.

- II. **Informing various Governance Councils:** Structurally the senate will inform leadership. Taskforce, committees, and their work product would inform a council and potentially more than one council. Those councils would advise leadership. One task that is important for committee leaders to decide is where their work fits in and if this informs the council or leadership. The suggestion is to review the decision-making guide.

3. Future Meeting Times/Days

4. Future Discussion Topics

#### **F. Unfinished Business**

*None*

#### **G. Announcements**

- Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates Fall 2024: Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>, Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> Dec. 5<sup>th</sup>. Spring 2025: Feb. 13<sup>th</sup>, Feb. 27<sup>th</sup>; March 13<sup>th</sup>, March 27<sup>th</sup>; April 17<sup>th</sup>; May 1<sup>st</sup>; May 15<sup>th</sup> & May 29<sup>th</sup>
- 2024 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session: Nov. 7<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup>, Visalia Convention Center, Visalia, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Spring Plenary: April 24 – 26<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Irvine, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session: Nov. 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>, Regency La Jolla, San Diego, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Curriculum Institute: July 9<sup>th</sup>- 12<sup>th</sup>, Ontario Convention Center, Ontario, CA.
- 2025 ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute: June 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, San Francisco Airport, CA.

#### **H. Adjournment:**

---

*If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Senate Office at [academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu](mailto:academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu) College of the Canyons.*

# Annual Curriculum Report – 11/14/2024

## A. Curriculum Committee overview

1. Co-chairs: Omar Torres and Tricia George
2. Meeting times: Thursdays, 3-5 PM, in Bonelli 330 & via Zoom (opposite Senate weeks during the semester)
3. Two subcommittees:
  - i. Noncredit Curriculum Committee: co-chaired by Dianne Avery and Garrett Rieck
  - ii. Curriculum IDEAA (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Antiracism) Subcommittee: focused on our local Cultural Competence requirement

## B. Credit Committee Members

1. Erin Barnthouse	Learning Resources
2. Kelly Bronco	Public Safety
3. Sarah Etheridge	Social and Behavioral Sciences
4. Leora Gabay	KHWFA
5. Mike Harutunian	Humanities
6. Holly Hitt-Zuniga	Applied Technologies
7. Julie Hovden	Student Services
8. Kristi Miura	Health Professions
9. Jennifer Overdevest	VAPA
10. Jeremy Patrich	MSE
11. Garrett Rieck	PPL, Faculty Co-Chair Noncredit
12. Lori Young	Business
13. Christopher Boltz	At-Large
14. Jaya George	At-Large
15. Carly Gott	At-Large
16. Cindy Leung	At-Large
17. Susan Ling	At-Large
18. Jesse Vera	At-Large
19. Linda Beauregard-Vasquez	Adjunct
20. Nazanin Naraghi	Adjunct
21. Ruth Rassool	Adjunct
22. Patrick Backes	Articulation Officer (non-voting)

## C. Committee background, purpose, objectives, and goals

1. **Background and Purpose:** California community colleges have Curriculum Committees because faculty decision-making about curriculum is #1 of the 10+1 areas listed in [Title 5's "Definitions" for faculty](#). Across the community college system, many Curriculum Committees are subcommittees of the Academic Senate

(as we are), and some are independent but still work with their Academic Senate. Largely our purpose is understood as allowing faculty to be the primary decision-makers for anything related to the curriculum that we develop and teach.

2. **Objectives and Goals:** In our current iteration at College of the Canyons (CoC), we are responsible for:
- i. Ensuring that revisions of our current Course Outlines of Record (COR's) happen within a 6 year period (locally we have a 5 year requirement).
  - ii. Facilitating discussions about and voting on whether the need for a new course and/or program proposal has been justified. (This is for proposals which don't include a consideration of extra resources (such as full-time hiring, facilities, equipment, or the like) as our Program Viability (PV) committee handles these more complex proposals.)
  - iii. Reviewing the COR's of new course proposals and courses on our 5 Year Revision List in detail to assure compliance with regulations originating from Title 5, the Chancellor's Office Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH), Accreditation, the Minimum Qualifications Handbook, and locally.
  - iv. Review program proposals (new degrees or certificates) according to regulations, again either statewide or locally.
  - v. Collaborating with programs to revitalize or archive courses not offered in at least 5 years.
  - vi. Communicating about and enacting our new local Cultural Competence requirement through presentations, Sandbox discussion groups, written communications, and one-on-one support offered via email, Zoom, or in-person.
  - vii. Communicating and enacting changes to COR's and programs based on legislation (e.g. AB 705, 1705, 928, and 1111) and Title 5 changes.
  - viii. Recommending changes to our local General Education (GE) requirements to the Academic Senate and deciding which courses meet each category of our local GE requirements.
  - ix. Reviewing Program Maps, especially in light of changes to programs due to any of the above.
  - x. Reviewing Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) and relevant Signature Assignments when we review COR's.
  - xi. Training our Curriculum Committees annually to achieve the above.

**Based on the above, we collaborate frequently with:**

- The Minimum Qualifications & Equivalency (MQ & E) committee
- The Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL)

- The Program Mapping coordinator

**D. Below are the Curriculum Activity totals for the 2023-20424 Academic Year**

New Credit Courses:  <b>88</b>	Modified Credit Courses:  <b>209</b>	Modified Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's):  <b>35</b>	Deleted Programs:  <b>2</b>
New Noncredit Courses:  <b>43</b>	Modified Noncredit Courses:  <b>61</b>	New Prerequisites:  <b>65</b>	Proposals Reviewed in Technical Review Sessions:  <b>415</b>
New Programs:  <b>29</b>	New Distance Education Addendums (DEA's):  <b>79</b>	Modified Prerequisites:  <b>39</b>	Proposals Returned from Technical Review Sessions for Further Revision:  <b>36</b>
Modified Programs:  <b>70</b>	New Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's):  <b>219</b>	Deleted Courses:  <b>36</b>	Technical Changes:  <b>105</b>

**E. Main objectives, goals, or projects for this year**

**1. [AB 928](#): CalGETC compliance**

While largely Student Services is responsible for most of the changes and coding needed for us to be compliant with AB 928, CalGETC will impact many of our transfer degrees (as far as the GE requirements) and Program Maps, and so we (primarily Patrick Backes, Julie Hovden, and Susan Ling) are also updating programs and Program Maps. Occasionally we also work with faculty to educate them about the new CalGETC standards which will be used by four year colleges to decide whether their courses will be approved for certain GE areas for CalGETC.

**2. [AB 1111](#): Common Course Numbering (CCN) compliance**

We are currently approving and submitting [Phase I courses for CCN](#), and this effort involves many areas on campus. On the Curriculum side, we reviewed each of the 13 Phase I COR's (6 courses + the Honors version for each course + 1 Statistics courses which has embedded support) for compliance with CCN requirements,

CalGETC standards, our local requirements, and usual Title 5 & Accreditation requirements.

There are 23 courses in 12 disciplines for [Phase II of CCN](#), and so we have also been communicating with impacted department chairs, deans, and Curriculum representatives as we prepare for this much larger Phase (likely including 46 actual COR's if there are Honors versions for each course in Phase II).

Common course numbering will also impact a number of our programs and Program Maps, so the hope is that we can meet starting in Winter 2025 to keep up with all of the updates we need to make to Program Maps due to CalGETC, CCN, and Local GE changes (below).

### **3. Local GE requirements compliance**

In November 2023, [Title 5 § 55061](#) was revised, changing some of the basic requirements for local GE's for local degrees. Some of the category names were changed, and Ethnic Studies was added as its own GE area. As CoC (and many other colleges) hadn't evaluated their local GE requirements in at least a decade, this has become an opportunity to consider any other changes we may want to make to our local GE requirements. Curriculum's Legislative Team worked in Spring 2024 to understand and communicate what was involved, and this Fall Curriculum discussed this topic and made a recommendation to the Senate on 10/31/24.

### **4. Cultural Competence requirement**

As part of a statewide effort to consider COR's through the lenses of Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Antiracism (IDEAA), as of Fall 2024 Curriculum is now requiring any COR's we review (whether on the 5 Year Revision List or new courses) to meet our local Cultural Competence requirement. Our goals include respecting each faculty's academic freedom and working with subject matter experts to consider how adding this component would make sense within each COR. I have written a [letter for colleagues](#) which further unpacks this topic, and we have a [Cultural Competence Checklist](#) we are using as a starting point for this work.

### **5. Reviewing new Health programs**

The Program Viability (PV) committee approved four new Health programs to be offered at CoC, and the goal was established for each to begin in Fall 2025:

- i. Physical Therapist Assistant (PTA - 24 COR's)
- ii. Pharmacy Technology (PHRMTEC - 8 COR's)
- iii. Occupational Therapy Assistant (OTA - 21 COR's)
- iv. Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS - 13 COR's)

As you can imagine, working with the above programs (in addition to legislative changes and our typical workload) has kept up very busy, although we have enjoyed working with these new colleagues very much.

#### **F. Challenges the committee has faced**

We feel very fortunate having 21 credit Curriculum Committee members (7 of which serve on the Curriculum IDEAA Subcommittee and 4 of which serve on our Legislative Team as needed) and 17 Noncredit Curriculum Committee members. We have excellent committee members who contribute continually and collaborate well, even as we are all continually training and improving in our work.

However, this Fall semester is the busiest I have ever experienced on the Curriculum Committee (and this is my 10<sup>th</sup> year on the committee), between needing to review the 21 OTA COR's for a hard deadline OTA has this December, discussing and making recommendations for our local GE requirements, keeping up with rapid and sometimes changing CCN requirements, and enacting our local Cultural Competence requirement.

We hope our colleagues understand that we are having to work more efficiently than ever to meet all of our deadlines and requirements. This means that we may be a little slower to respond to questions, proposals, recommendations, concerns, and the like, and this mean that we may also unintentionally confuse you but we are happy to clarify anything as needed.

#### **G. Support needed**

Phase I of CCN went fairly smoothly for us at CoC, but it still required a lot of time and effort – both for the departments chosen to be part of Phase I and for the Curriculum Committee to keep track of, communicate about, and review these courses. Because Phase I of CCN also had very tight timelines, it kept us on our toes.

Phase II has about 4 times as many core courses (23 as opposed to 6) and may have similar tight timelines in the Spring if we are expected to revise all 23 (or possibly 46 if we count Honors courses) COR's by the end of Spring 2025 (due to a summer deadline we may need to meet for the University of California system).

I will need more support to review these courses this Spring, and I would request that some of the roughly \$900,000 allocated to each community college for CCN be made available to faculty who are either responsible for revising CCN COR's or for reviewing them.

Further, as the combined changes mandated from CalGETC, CCN, and local GE changes mean that most of our Program Maps need to be updated and continually updated through each phase of CCN, a plan needs to be developed locally to facilitate this massive workload.

#### **H. Upcoming Senate Agenda items**

We have recently proposed our local GE recommendations to the Senate (and these will be discussed further at Senate meetings in Fall 2024). In addition, our routine agendas and summaries are reviewed and approved by the Senate. Further, I imagine there will be periodic updates about CCN, CalGETC, and Cultural Competence throughout the year.

**Committee on Academic Freedom  
Conditional Report:**

**Faculty and Grading: Grade Penalties  
& Due Process in the Era of Generative AI**

October 2024

Karyl Kicenski  
Chair

Chris Blakey  
Member

Tricia George  
Member

Garrett Hooper  
Member

Urvashi Juneja  
Member

Collette Salvatierra  
Member

Prepared for College of the Canyons Academic Senate

## I. Introduction and Context

There has been a recent explosion of cheating and plagiarism amongst the student population at the College of the Canyons (and presumably at other colleges and universities, as well). This problem has been exacerbated by the combination of larger numbers of online course offerings, and the development of large-language models of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) available to the student population. Hence, it is no longer a rarity for a faculty member to find that a student has used GAI to complete some particular assignment or prompt on an exam.<sup>1</sup> The nature of plagiarism and cheating has changed significantly with the advent of GAI. An instructor typically sees less blatant, word-for-word plagiarism lifted out of an online site or written source. This “old style” plagiarism is rather easily detected and detection does not require expertise in subject matter. However, today, instructors see prose that has been produced by GAI. The GAI content will often be reasonably accurate about what it is describing, but will also display a conspicuous absence of conceptual details emphasized by the instructor in their particular class or speak in a “voice” unlike the student’s. In other words, the content of the submission demonstrates a significant disconnect from the specific content of the class, yet is reasonably “on target” as general information. This is a problem, and the type of problem that someone who has not taught the class (e.g., administrators or staff) could reasonably notice and identify. Further, one of the signs of GAI plagiarism is the use of relatively sophisticated phrasing that typical college students, still in lower-division courses, have not yet developed. This is especially true in a course whose content is a student’s initial exposure to the subject. This, again, is not easily detectable by someone who is not an expert in the field. Such concerns underscore the value and necessity of faculty responsibility for grading and assessment.

In light of the above, the question has arisen as to whether a faculty member has the right to assign a score of zero on a particular assignment if they have found the student to have cheated or committed plagiarism.<sup>2</sup> There is disagreement within our institution on this

---

<sup>1</sup>It is acknowledged that in some disciplines, use of GAI may be appropriate for some student work. The problem we are concerned with here is any kind of student academic use of Chat-GPT that has been specifically prohibited by the instructor. These would be cases where it is important for students to learn to be able to think and put ideas together for themselves, as opposed to depending on some other entity to do so for them.

<sup>2</sup> We are using the following definition of plagiarism: the use of ideas other than one’s own in writing, speaking, or

question. The reason for the disagreement centers on tensions existing between legal requirements, the current Santa Clarita Community College District's administrative policy surrounding academic dishonesty, and academic freedom on the part of faculty. In this Conditional Report we shall explain the relevant legal requirements, the Academic Policy at COC being used currently, and principles of academic freedom of faculty to assign grades<sup>3</sup> communicated by American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

## **II. The Legal Requirement**

The US Supreme Court has declared that public institutions must provide at least minimal due process in connection with many forms of student discipline.<sup>4</sup> A number of cases have held that students are entitled to due process when discipline is imposed for academic dishonesty. Accordingly, policies at public institutions of higher education commonly provide for due process when associated with "grade penalties" for academic dishonesty.<sup>5</sup>

The term "grade penalty" may be used to mean a grade assigned in order to register some form of student misconduct in connection to a course assignment. In other words, if a student is caught cheating or plagiarizing content, a decreased grade may be given on the assignment in question. In such cases, a "grade penalty" has been invoked. The law requires some minimal form of due process for students in this case. Students receiving a "grade penalty" on a particular assignment must be made aware of the reason for the penalty, and must be provided an opportunity to challenge the appropriateness of the assigned grade.

Nowhere in the above stated legal requirement is there detailed specification of the exact form such due process must take. Hence, the door is open for a number of options an institution might choose to fulfill the legally required due process.

## **III. The College of the Canyons Student Conduct Code Provisions**

The current policy for alleged misconduct of students for academic violations such as

---

artistic-content without acknowledging their proper source.

<sup>3</sup> The Committee seeks to make clear what has been written by the most authoritative entity for academic freedom in the US – the American Association of University Professors – concerning faculty responsibility in assessment and grading.

<sup>4</sup> Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975); Fourteenth Amendment.

<sup>5</sup> Gary Collis is acknowledged for his assistance with this legal analysis.

plagiarism is to bring the matter to the attention of the Office of the Dean of Students (or designee).<sup>6</sup> The Student Conduct Code<sup>7</sup> (SCC) states, “the Dean of Students *in consultation with the Academic Senate* [italics ours] will develop specific procedures to address alleged violations of academic and/or classroom misconduct” (26).

There are two issues with the current SCC policies (or lack thereof) in relationship to student plagiarism and academic freedom. First, the procedure to be followed to ensure due process, specifically related to a grade penalty, is not addressed within the SCC. While the text outlining the policies provides broad outlines of procedures the Dean of Students may take in a case of academic misconduct, it does not adequately address how the college should deal with plagiarism cases, and particularly those assisted by GAI.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, much of the SCC discussion of due process seems to focus predominantly upon misconduct relating to sexual assault and/or harassment, as opposed to academic violations. Finally, while the text of the SCC states that consultation with the Academic Senate will take place to develop a process to “address alleged violations of academic and/or classroom misconduct,” no such process has seemingly been established that would ensure due process. The first issue, therefore, is that the SCC does not present a clear policy directing how due process will take place.

Second, the content which does appear in the SCC potentially challenges the academic freedom of faculty to assign grades on academic work submitted by students. This is due to the unilateral power afforded the Dean of Students (or designee) in cases where a student has been accused of academic misconduct and may have received a “grade penalty.” For example, the SCC states that the Dean may, without limit or consultation, determine that there is no violation by a given student, and accordingly close the case:

---

<sup>6</sup> The COC Policy Committee is presently working on a new policy regarding cases where grade penalties are assigned. To the Committee’s credit, it is attempting to formulate a policy that is practical and functional in light of the plethora of cases of cheating and plagiarism at the College. However, at this point, it appears that administrative personnel will have a decision-making role in the due process procedure, possibly undermining faculty judgment in such cases.

<sup>7</sup> Student Conduct Code, Santa Clarita College District: Board of Trustees Policies 5529, 5530, 5531 (Revised June 2018) <https://www.canyons.edu/studentservices/conduct/>

<sup>8</sup> The Committee recognizes that the issues surrounding plagiarism facilitated by GAI have arisen more recently. Yet, while this omission is understandable, we believe it ought to be addressed.

In cases in which the Dean (or designee) determines that there is not cause to believe that a violation may have occurred, the Dean (or designee) may decide that the case will not be pursued further. If the allegation concerned academic and/or classroom misconduct, the Dean (or designee) will contact the complainant to explain his or her reasoning. The complainant may appeal the decision to not pursue discipline, within 10 working days, to the Vice President of Instruction (28).<sup>9</sup>

The term “complainant,” above refers to a faculty-member bringing a case against a student (for example, in the event of plagiarism, cheating, or inappropriate use of GAI). In academic misconduct cases, a close reading of the SCC text explains that if the Dean of Students believes there is no evidence to substantiate the case being brought by a faculty-member, it may simply be closed unilaterally. The faculty-member is thus left without recourse, unless he or she appeals the case to the Vice President of Instruction.

The Dean of Students (or designee) may also choose to “refer the matter to other campus and/or community resources” (28). If the Dean makes this choice, it is also a unilateral decision, as the text of the SCC makes clear. Faculty-members are not a part of that decision-making process.

Finally, the Dean of Students may call for an interview with the student-respondent for the purpose of an “initial hearing” (29). The procedures for this hearing do not stipulate that faculty be included. However, at this hearing, an “Informal Agreement of Resolution” may be determined wherein the student conceivably agrees to an arrangement to resolve the case (for example, the student may be disciplined or perhaps a grade penalty is assigned). To be clear, none of the options outlined by the SCC clearly guide a process of adjudicating academic grade penalties with due process *which include faculty*. While a “Student Conduct Committee” is mentioned in the SCC, it is the Dean of Students (or designee) who decides whether or not a case will be forwarded to this Committee. There is only one exception: that is when a student makes a request that the Dean do so. Careful examination demonstrates that faculty are not involved in the current policies and procedures governing academic misconduct and due process. As we make clear below, the omission of faculty from this process—particularly where a grade penalty has been given, is a violation of academic freedom, because faculty must be the source for academic assessment and grading.

#### **IV. The AAUP and Faculty Responsibility in Grading and Assessment**

The AAUP clearly states that faculty, and only faculty, have the responsibility to assign

---

<sup>9</sup> Student Conduct Code, Santa Clarita College District: Board of Trustees Policies 5529, 5530, 5531 (Revised June 2018) <https://www.canyons.edu/studentservices/conduct/>.

grades on academic work submitted by students.<sup>10</sup> The AAUP goes on to say “. . .[t]he review of a student complaint over a grade should be by faculty, under procedures adopted by faculty, and any resulting change in a grade should be by faculty authorization.”<sup>11</sup> Clearly, the policy indicates that supplementing the judgement of faculty in the assignment of grades is a breach of academic freedom. Moreover, the AAUP writes in *The Freedom to Teach*, faculty have the right to “assess student academic performance in teaching activities for which faculty members are individually responsible, without having their decisions subject to the veto of a department chair, dean, or other administrative officer.”<sup>12</sup> Not only are faculty assigned the sole responsibility for grading students, but according to the AAUP, “Under no circumstances should administrative officers on their own authority substitute their judgment for that of the faculty concerning the assignment of a grade.”<sup>13</sup> In short, the current policies in the College’s SCC open the door for an administrator (or a designee of that administrator) to make decisions about academic violations—specifically grade penalties—that may override faculty control of assessment of student work, thus limiting the academic freedom of faculty.

## V. Recommendations

Students have the right to appeal a grade and this appeal process should respect the prerogatives of instructors and the rights of students.<sup>14</sup> The current policies and procedures outlined in the SCC ought to be revised to accommodate the new realities of GAI, and a consideration of academic freedom of faculty in assessment and grading matters. The AAUP recommends an initial discussion between the course instructor and the student in cases wherein a grievance arises over the assignment of a grade.<sup>15</sup> If that discussion does not resolve

---

<sup>10</sup>“The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals,” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 29-30.

<sup>11</sup>“The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals,” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 29.

<sup>12</sup>“The Freedom to Teach,” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 28.

<sup>13</sup> “The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals,” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 29-30.

<sup>14</sup> American Association of University Professors, “The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals,” *Policy Documents and Reports* (Washington D.C., 2015) 29.

<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately, because of the significant disconnect between students and faculty due to the dynamics of distance learning (relative to in-person education), the importance of this initial discussion between instructor and

the issue, then another member of the faculty should be brought into the process (perhaps the department chair). If the issue is still not resolved, the matter should be referred to an *ad hoc* committee.<sup>16</sup> However, there are some caveats to consider in the creation of such a committee. Any group tasked with hearing student grade challenges will need to make choices about how it is comprised, the processes that might be followed, and the chronological steps to be taken. The AAUP's position is that the process and decision-making regarding grades should ultimately rest with faculty. And while such an *ad hoc* committee might include administrators, staff, and/or students, there are restrictions upon how those individuals contribute to the work of the committee and its ultimate decision making. An administrator may be able to helpfully connect students with needed services available on campus that may come to light during a conversation about a grade on an assignment, for example. A student's voice on the committee may help an instructor understand another student's situation in ways that may be significant in the case. In this way, others on a college campus may assist in a dispute and provide feedback in discussions of a disputed grade assignment. However, academic freedom requires that the procedures for an *ad hoc* committee must be faculty driven, and furthermore, that the ultimate judgment of student work must be made by faculty ensuring that any change in a grade be made by faculty authorization.

---

student is often all but forgotten.

<sup>16</sup> "The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals," 30.

## **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (AIC) PROCEDURES**

### **I. Mission Statement**

The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) is a sub-committee of the Academic Senate that plays a key advisory role in promoting and maintaining academic integrity across the College. The Committee's primary function is to provide guidance, recommendations, and practical strategies to faculty, administration, and other campus groups in addressing academic integrity concerns comprehensively and collaboratively. These concerns are not limited to preventing academic misconduct; instead, they encompass a broader commitment to fostering values like honesty, responsibility, and ethical behavior throughout all academic activities. The Committee encourages a more holistic approach that empowers students to develop meaningful principles, such as integrity, accountability, and respect for the work of others, in all their academic pursuits. By fostering a collegial and inclusive environment, the AIC aims to influence policy and practice in a constructive and impactful way. The AIC is not responsible for handling individual student conduct violations; instead, it focuses on proactive measures, such as developing white papers, resolutions, and best practices that address a range of academic integrity issues. These efforts include examining the impact of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI), which present new challenges and opportunities in maintaining academic standards. The Committee's proactive measures are designed to not only mitigate academic misconduct but also to support a culture of integrity through education.

### **II. Committee Duties and Functions**

The Committee is charged with the following duties and functions on behalf of the Academic Senate:

1. Advising the Academic Senate on issues of academic integrity.
2. Developing policy recommendations, educational guidelines, best practices, and comprehensive reports related to academic integrity.
3. Proposing new ideas and providing recommendations for policies and procedures aimed at promoting academic integrity.
4. Supporting educational initiatives that inform students and faculty about the importance of academic integrity.
5. Recommending proactive strategies to reduce academic integrity violations, such as enhancing course design and academic practices.

### **III. Membership**

#### **A. General Requirements**

1. All members of the Committee must be tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct faculty of the College.
2. At no time shall the Committee have fewer than three members.
3. The Academic Senate President shall appoint a member of the faculty to serve as Chair for a two-year term. The full Academic Senate shall ratify the appointment.

4. The Committee shall strive to include at least one representative from each academic school/division.
5. The Committee shall strive to include at least one adjunct faculty member.

**B. Membership Appointment/Tenure**

1. Members may be appointed by the Committee Chair or the President of the Academic Senate.
2. All appointments must be confirmed by a majority of a quorum of the Academic Senate.
3. Appointments can occur during any semester to fill a vacancy that reduces Committee composition below three members.
4. Members are expected to serve a minimum of one full academic year but may resign at any time.
5. Members may be removed for non-performance by a majority vote of the other active Committee members with the approval of the Academic Senate President.

**C. Responsibilities of the Committee Chair**

1. Serve a two-year term.
2. Serve as a member of the Academic Senate's Executive Committee.
3. Submit an annual committee status report to the Academic Senate.
4. Recruit and manage Committee membership, ensuring diverse representation.
5. Schedule Committee meetings and set agendas in consultation with members.
6. Lead the development of resources and initiatives related to academic integrity.
7. Coordinate with faculty, administration, and other campus groups to address academic integrity concerns.
8. Communicate the Committee's work and recommendations to the Academic Senate and the broader campus community.
9. Advocate for the adoption of the Committee's recommendations where appropriate.

**D. Membership Responsibilities**

1. Attend all regularly scheduled meetings.
2. Be collaborative, engage in collegial discussions, be respectful of other members and presenters and their different points of view, and consider the college and community as a whole, not just the constituent group that the member represents.
3. Take an active role in the creation and review process of documents produced by the Committee.
4. Undertake due diligence in reviewing academic integrity guidelines, policies, and procedures.
5. Make advisory votes on proposals.
6. Conduct research as required.
7. Members of the committee representing academic schools will report back to and solicit feedback from their constituencies regarding academic integrity issues

#### **IV. Meetings**

##### **A. Dates**

1. The Committee will meet monthly based on members' availability. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed based on current priorities or pressing issues. Meeting dates and times are subject to change based on members' availability.

##### **B. Procedures**

1. The Committee shall establish its own guidelines to govern committee meetings and operations, and these guidelines should be documented and approved by the Committee to ensure clarity and consistency.

##### **C. Voting**

1. The Committee will conduct advisory votes to determine consensus on recommendations. These votes are non-binding and are used to inform the final recommendations made to the Academic Senate.