MIRACOSTA COLLEGE | **ACADEMIC SENATE**

OFFICAL MINUTES

We respectfully acknowledge that MiraCosta is on the traditional territory of the Luiseño/ Payómkawichum people. Today, this meeting place and surrounding areas are home to the six federally recognized bands of the La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Pechanga, Rincon, Soboba Luiseño/ Payómkawichum people and remain the shared space among Kumeyaay and Ipai peoples. In addition, we pay respect to elders, present and past: keepers of history, culture, wisdom, and knowledge.

I. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 9:00am.

II. **Remote Member Attendance**
Description: *Acdemic Senate will consider remote participation of members under the provisions of AB2449, if any.*
Erica Duran and Julie Graboi requested remote participation under the Just Cause provision of AB2449. Their remote participation under the Just Cause provision of AB2449 was approved by unanimous consent.

III. **Roll Call**
Members present: curry mitchell (President), Robin Allyn, Daniel Ante-Contreras, Sunny Cooke (Ex-officio), Leigh Cotnoir, Sean Davis (Vice-president), Erica Duran, Julie Graboi, Sarah Gross, Jim Julius (Coordinating Officer), Jeffrey Murico, Ghada Osman, Brian Page, Nate Scharf, Alexis Tucker Sade, Krista Warren, Afifa Zaman
Members present via Just Cause (AB2449): Erica Duran, Julie Graboi
Others present: Denée Pescarmona, Jack Tarman

IV. **Persons Wishing to Address the Senate** – None.

V. **Changes to Agenda Order –** None.

VI. **Consent Calendar**
A. **Approve Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2024**
B. **Approve Minutes of Retreat of August 9, 2024**
C. **Ratify Updated Faculty Committee Assignments List for AY 2024-2025**
D. **Approve Modified 2025-2026 Academic Calendar**
Description: *The District and Classified Senate have come to an agreement for the Christmas Eve holiday starting in the 2025-26 academic year. Attached is the revised calendar. There are no substantive changes to academic days that would impact other bargaining groups.*

The consent calendar was approved by unanimous consent.

VII. **Periodic Review – Academic Senate Bylaws and Academic Senate Rules**
A. **Bylaws ARTICLE 2 Purpose and Rules Section G, "members with a constituent group" 1-7**
Description: *Humanized, just-in-time preparation to perform the duties of representing the faculty of MiraCosta College, keeping constituents informed of Academic Senate issues and decisions, and soliciting input and agenda items from constituents to present to the Academic Senate.*
The Senate looked at correspondence with constituents as a duty of being a senator. Liaison rules need to be created, and two positions need to be fill along with an AI taskforce. The rules were read and described the duties of senate members reaching out and communicating with their constituents. Rules 1 through 7 were outlined such as keeping constituents informed, soliciting input from constituents, relaying input, and maintaining confidentiality if requested.
Discussion ensued. It was noted that Academic Senate used to be a Senate of the whole and the entire faculty would come together to make decisions. Now, this Senate is a representative Senate.
It is also different for AF Senators to reach their constituents. In recent years, they have come together to come up with ways to make it interesting with links in their communication to go deeper if they want to.
It was asked how it was decided that Senate can accurately represent a diverse population and can this be done correctly. It was explained that the decision to move away from the council as a whole was

because working conditions were separated into the FA. Those changes happened together. Decisions being made as a whole body were difficult such as getting a quorum. It was asked if there is a way to reorganize the constituents list to be better represented. This could impact elections, and this is a great idea. However, it was also noted that there could be silos. For AF senators, instead of specific groups, look at it along the lines of how we can best support AF as a whole rather than individuals going to just one senator. In trying to find ways to connect but not just with email, one senator started a Google site to provide a place to show what was discussed in the Senate meeting as a more engaging way to produce the information and get feedback. The visuals and layouts stand out from emails and the interactive piece is good. When looking at the list of constituents it is also worth a follow up with department chairs in the Senator's particular constituent list.

MSU (Warren / Osman) to extend the time for this discussion for an additional five minutes.

mitchell can add Tucker Sade's email communication as a model on the AS webpage. Some things to include in communication with constituents is, here are things that will impact you, introduce yourself and talk about your job is to represent you; can ask for feedback on a particular item or items.
It was noted that as a resource on the representative constituents' page is a video on how to create Outlook groups for constituents.

VIII. Information / Discussion
A. Leadership and Liaisons
Description: *Senate members will debrief topics and goals discussed during the Academic Senate Retreat and identify opportunities for leadership, including local and state-wide liaison roles that may be assigned (Academic Senate Rules, Section G.7).*
The topic of leadership and liaison roles was opened up for discussion prompting that since the retreat, how has this notion of being a liaison impacted you. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have a Senator as a liaison on some of the subcommittees, especially for those committees that have a big impact. Should be more targeted for where time is being committed or having liaisons where there are big initiatives occurring such as coming down from the Chancellor's office (the state). Perhaps a common course numbering liaison. It was asked if there could be more people involved with committees if there were more paid positions for AF to participate on some committees and to lighten the load for our full-time colleagues. Concern was noted for embedding people into committees. Further, we are not experts and will need to learn the issues to become conversant on a particular issue.
With the model of the calendar taskforce, this is the best representation. It sometimes feels top down but there are times when bringing people in from other groups, it completes the process.
Can focus on one of two areas: reaching out or top down. Would rather put energy into reaching out to constituents and bringing their communication forward. It was asked how Senators can represent their constituents if they are not in those committees.

MSU (mitchell / Page) to extend the time for this discussion for an additional two minutes.

Senators were asked to think about where their time going and what spaces they are in already. Taking this from Dr. Cooke and how she operates with the Board, between meetings an email will be sent with AS basic materials. Business cannot be done in an email but if there are questions, send them directly to the AS President and he can send the questions to the speaker who will address the item on the agenda.
Dr. Cooke noted that the college takes the people who they think are best to do certain things. AS has the ability for the committee to seek input. Trust the folks to do the work who are most knowledgeable and who may have more resources.
B. Faculty-led, A.I. Taskforce
Description: *Discuss the next steps and priority for the faculty-led, A.I. taskforce; develop a charge with achievable goals for the taskforce based on prior work, current approaches across higher ed, and the merging needs of academic disciplines, student learners, and racially-just, equity practicing programs.*
This AI taskforce operated last spring. The taskforce will likely work in conjunction with other groups working with AI. There is generative productivity AI technology that everyone can use. The AI taskforce is faculty led. There are student-centered, learning-centered, and teacher-centered approaches when thinking about all of this and they all intersect. Students might face equity and accessibility. A learning centered approach might be critical thinking and academic integrity issues. A teacher-centered approach might be pedagogy, practice, and course design.
The history of what faculty have done at MCC in response to generative AI is that they first started off as an initial Exploratorium interested in a space sharing resources and they created a Canvas course and putting everything there like some practices and big picture things. Rick White and Jim Sullivan have been offering ongoing AI hands on discovery labs weekly or biweekly. The CSIT department has developed an

AI program where faculty are teaching and equipping our students. Departments are also grappling with what is going on and some faculty are evaluating the situation in their own spaces. A lot of people are doing a lot of work. As a taskforce is being formed, what would be its role, would it be connecting these groups together or might it be serving a specific niche that is not being served.

At a workshop during Flex week, Jim Sullivan offered three areas around AI where there is consensus:

1. Faculty have a responsibility to communicate AI policies to their classes. Students need to know where we are.
2. The use of AI in class should help students cultivate thinking or should it replace their thinking.
3. There is no easy fix to this. There will not be an AI detector that fixes the problem.

mitchell's position is that the best groups to be leading in this space should be academic departments. They would benefit from leadership in terms of resources being shared, processes being modeled, and perhaps guidance being offered. It was also noted that there is a fifth Friday in January next spring, and it could be an opportunity that could be devoted to AI and this taskforce could build or deliver something for that day that could benefit departments. Julius further added information about what last spring's AI taskforce did. They landed on a process that was to look through the lens of MCC's institutional stated values and looked at how AI is impacting, challenging, and supporting each of those values. They agreed on the first couple of values that we should prioritize human agency and community in these discussions and keeping those things in mind as we continue with whatever comes next.

ASG representative, Jack Tarman, was asked of his experience with AI in the classroom; is he being told how to use it, when to use it, or not to use. He offered that in the last 12 months his professors have been told students not to use AI and that if they see any evidence of AI in writing assignments or in their assessments, they will be given a grade of zero. There has been a push against AI in the classroom. Among conversations with other students, some are positive, and others are skeptical.

He gave an example of an English composition where AI can do your work totally for you including MLA formatting for your works cited page for your bibliography. Everything the course is trying to teach you will be done for you. A lot of work to do before knowing how to deal with AI.

It was agreed that a PSA would be helpful for the student body. He agrees there is a lot of work to do before we figure out where the line ends between what we allow AI to do for us and what students should learn on their own. Students don't have a formal way to argue against not using AI. He noted that instructors are laying it out in their syllabus at the beginning of their courses otherwise students will just blatantly use AI to skim through the course.

Some discussion ensued concerning AI detectors and they are not foolproof. They disadvantage English language learners especially because many times English language learners write in a way that feels artificially formal and trigger an AI detector to think that it is AI. There are instructors not doing much research on AI and so they push back on it. It is concerning from a student perspective, how do they prove that it is not the case if the AI detector said that they cheated.

It was observed that there are two schools of thought from faculty, those leaning in and those pushing back. Pushing back is a losing battle and so need to help faculty teach prompting about what they do. Different disciplines will do it differently. How does the taskforce do this and how will it benefit the department to evaluate student experiences and how is it helping or disrupting?

It is suggested to keep up the communication between faculty and students. Get a sense and open up conversations where you can ask questions such as did you use AI and what did you use it for.

Include it on the syllabus and the instructor reserves the right to have a discussion with the student. The more intentional we are about incorporating those discussions the more instructive and less inquisitorial. If you rely on AI detectors you rely on them to give you a nudge about a specific student. You may have some false positives. You are penalizing the students who are not good at using AI. You are not catching all the students and sometimes catching some students incorrectly. Perhaps the best way to tackle this issue it to try to even the playing field and offer workshops to inform the proper ways to use it and the dos and don'ts about using AI. In the design department they require students to show their process. AI can be another tool and if you don't learn it you will be left in the dust. It is helpful for academia to understand how this is working in the world of business. There is zero compunction about using AI in the business world because they are afraid of legal ramifications. Instead, they are using it within their own institutions with their own employees. How can you use this as a tool as part of the process that helps you evolve your thinking. It is a new game changing tool and a paradigm shift.

It was offered that we have left people in the dust before with a number of things. If we go back to the 10+1, we have curriculum, grading policies, professional development, standards or policies for student prep and success, so the real question might be that within our purview, what would we like this task force to do or do we even want a task force and what does it do within the 10+1.

It was mentioned that the Statewide Academic Senate just released a document about AI aimed at local Academic Senates trying to work on AI policies. It is pretty good but also has some holes in it. It has a list in the document of things that we might want to think about when we are providing leadership around the use of AI such as ethical considerations, compliance and legal considerations, accountability and oversight training needs. The hold is that it doesn't speak to what we actually really need to be thinking about such as revising our curriculum or our outcomes and do we need to rethink what we are teaching because students are going to use AI.

mitchell offered 5 different charges/goals the Senate might choose for the taskforce. One starting point for this taskforce might be that they design and launch a workgroup in the spring asking what's going on, where's the need, what would this work group look like, who would be involved. Another option: maybe it would shape itself as a research group and work with students asking when, how, and why are students using what tools. The task force, working with students could design a couple of workshops for students about when and when not to use a tool like this, here's when to reach out to your professor if you attempt to use the tool. Alternatively, when thinking of departments, and when thinking of discipline experts, when, how, and why are discipline experts and industry folks using what tools. Disciplines can ask what do our students need to know about these tools so that they are equipped to be marketable and hirable. These are two things: research group for students and research groups for departments.

Still another option, the task force can be focused on one assessment method like writing to assess critical thinking. What are the tools that are disrupting critical thinking or measures of critical thinking. In writing, what guidance can be offered, or what models of course redesign can be offered.

Finally, another option is the taskforce could be thinking about the fifth Friday and work with other departments, groups, and/or committees.

Dr. Cooke noted that the more important discussions are about focusing on the future such as five or ten years out while we are dealing with all the stuff that has been talked about that impacts us today.

Therefore, focus on the immediate as we focus on the longer term.

We have a duty to our students to educate them as new leaders.

An email will be sent to senators asking to share the five task force options with their constituents and to ask for some feedback that can be shared at the next meeting.

IX. **Reports (Written, Included Via Links Below)**
   Visit the links for the Reports.
   A. **Academic Senate President** – *curry mitchell* ([access report](#))
   B. **College Superintendent/President** – *Sunny Cooke* ([access report](#))
   C. **Classified Senate** – *Carl Banks* ([access report](#))
   D. **Associate Student Government** – *Jack Tarman* ([access report](#))
   E. **Senator Reports** ([access report](#))

X. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 11:00am.