I. Announcements
1. Committee Request for Change to Charge Approved by Senate 10/22/10
2. Changes to catalog language regarding absence and enrollment status
   1. AIC Chair met with VPSS who argued that complexity of compliance issues favors administrative revision, acknowledged faculty interests and agreed to run revision past AIC (and, if timeline allows, through AIC to Senate).
3. Spring 2011 Thursday of Flex Workshop on the Discipline Process
4. Spring 2011 Thursday of Flex Workshop on managing student behavior
5. Spring 2011 Convocation Breakout Session on Civility (Please sign up; see Nancy Edmonson’s 12/14/2010 4:04 PM e-mail.)

II. Update regarding the proposed AIC-CASSL event on students understanding of citation in various levels of English Writing courses (Emmanuel Sigauke, David Weinshilboum)
1. Emmanuel (via e-mail): “…We are waiting to hear from the CASSL committee as to whether we will be assigned a Spring slot for workshops.”
2. David: (No addition).

III. Faculty Academic Integrity Survey
1. 10/28/10 David, Sonny and Rick met to hear a disciplinary appeal (student representation was also present!). Upon appellant no-show, AIC representatives discussed, inter alia, faculty perception of, and support for AIC. David commented that there currently isn’t really a dialogue. Positions (in support of or not in support of AIC efforts) are hardened. Faculty “opt out” if they don’t approve because they “know their students”. Sonny emphasized the importance of consistency to student understanding. All agreed, an “open ended” survey of faculty to initiate a dialogue is called for.
   1. Are you aware of the college’s official student academic integrity process and protocols (e.g. Honor Code, catalog definitions and examples of cheating and plagiarism, protocols regarding Referral for Student Code of Conduct Violation)
2. Do you follow the college’s official student academic integrity process and protocols? Why/Why not?
3. In what ways do you support student academic integrity at CRC?
ACTION: Committee to review these questions for edit before distribution to faculty at large.
IV. Discussion of the AIDE (Academic Integrity in Distance Education Joint Subcommittee) Report

1. Lynn express doubts as to the actual extent of the “authentication and identification problem” (roughly, the problem of confirming that students who take on-line classes or on-line assessments or brick-and-mortar assessments for otherwise on-line classes are who they say they are) given existing college protocols (e.g. for financial aid)

2. Rick suggested that the extent of the problem isn’t so important; whatever the extent of the problem, it seems clear that a problem exists.

3. Lynn suggested an appropriate solution to a problem is proportional to the problem.

4. Lynn expressed concerns about the legality and advisability of requiring students to authenticate their identities (prove they are who they and their id’s say they are) as opposed to merely requiring students to produce identification (an id that says they are who they say they are).

5. Markus maintained that authentication is a reasonable request.