



# FOOTHILL COLLEGE

## Teaching with Technology

November 8, 2024					
Date: 11/8/2024		Time: 11:00am-12:00pm		Location: Zoom	
Teaching With Technology Members by Division					
<b>APP:</b> Nate Vennarucci; <b>HSH:</b> Pia Stanaa, Sally Baldwin <b>BSS:</b> Brian Evans, Kas Pereira, Kevin Wang-Nava (round-robin) <b>KA:</b> Katy Ripp; Warren Voyce <b>FA&amp;C:</b> Amy Shidler; Oldooz (Oli) Mohammadi <b>Language Arts:</b> Kimberly Escamilla; <b>vacant</b> <b>STEM:</b> Mike Murphy, Robert Sandor, Bitá Mazloom (W, Sp) <b>Library:</b> Laura Gamez; <b>Counseling:</b> Nora Yan <b>Co-chairs:</b> Allison Lenkeit Meezan, Lené Whitley-Putz. <b>FA Representative:</b> Steve Batham <b>ASFC Representative:</b> <b>vacant</b> <b>Friends of COOL:</b> Cheyanne Cortez, Stephanie Crosby, Dolores Davison, Stacy Gleixner, Hilary Gomes, Helen Graves, Carolyn Holcroft, Kurt Hueg, Jackie Lauese, Kathryn Maurer, Rick Martinez, Amy Sarver, Paula Schales, Voltaire Villanueva, Sarah Williams,					
<a href="#">TwT Representatives Roles and Meeting Norms</a>					
Agenda					
	Item	Discussion lead	Item type	Links	Time
1	Approval of minutes from 11/1/2024	Allison	Action	<a href="#">Draft minutes from 11/1/2024</a>	11:00
2	Academic Senate Updates	Allison	Information, Discussion	<a href="#">Student Affairs</a> <a href="#">Academic Integrity</a> <a href="#">AI Use</a>	11:05
3	POCR Rubric Revision	Sally	Action	<a href="#">POCR Rubric Revision</a>	11:30
4	Accessibility rubric for J1B/J1C evaluations	Allison	Information, Discussion		11:40
5	Online Learning Updates	Lené	Information, Discussion		11:45

Fall 2024 TWT meetings. Agenda and minutes can be accessed at the [Academic Senate TwT site](#)

Meeting dates: 10/18, 11/1, 11/8, 11/22, 12/6

Fall 2024 Academic Senate meeting dates: 9/30, 10/14, 10/28, 11/4, 11/18, 12/2

Zoom link: <https://fhda->

[edu.zoom.us/j/89432127668?pwd=8SRmr6TxScXVhzNJDjtzGmRsKDnNa5.1&from=addon](https://fhda-edu.zoom.us/j/89432127668?pwd=8SRmr6TxScXVhzNJDjtzGmRsKDnNa5.1&from=addon)

Meeting ID: 894 3212 7668

Passcode: 279882

**Join COOL on CANVAS:**

<https://foothillcollege.instructure.com/enroll/3PTMYP>



## FOOTHILL COLLEGE

# Teaching with Technology

Present  
Brian Evans  
Amy  
Sally  
Pia  
Allison  
Bob Sandor  
Nora Yan  
Warren Voyce  
Kevin Wang-Nava  
Dolores  
Paula Schales  
Kimberly  
Steve Batham  
Lene  
Cas  
Micaela  
Stephanie Crosby  
Helen

Item 1 – Approve minutes from last meeting  
Approved (8 yes)

Item 2 - Academic Integrity and AI Use

Statement for the student facing handbook  
Catalina was invited today, though not present. Student affairs is aware of this paragraph/statement

---

### [Student Handbook](#) & [Academic Integrity](#) Website

Foothill College acknowledges that AI tools are rapidly evolving and can support meeting course objectives but can also serve to bypass learning. If your instructor has outlined a course-specific policy on AI use, please follow those guidelines carefully. In the absence of a specific policy, students are expected to use AI tools in ways that align with the [Standards of Student Conduct](#). This means avoiding any use of AI that could misrepresent your own knowledge, skills, or original work. If you are unsure about what is allowed, please ask your instructor for clarification.



## FOOTHILL COLLEGE

# Teaching with Technology

Sally – consider removing “AI tools are rapidly evolving” bc it’s self-evident.

Stephanie – Disability uses AI, so can we make this clear. Wouldn’t want to bar students from access to course materials if they need AI tools.

Helen - And we wouldn’t want a literal-minded interpretation to mean a student whose tool integrates AI thinks they can’t use the tool at all.

Lene –AI can be both a bridge to knowledge, especially for disability students, and it can be used as a bypass knowledge.

**advanced automated tools** (artificial intelligence or machine learning tools such as ChatGPT or Dall-E 2)

Cas – the term in our paragraph “misrepresents your knowledge” covers that.

Robert - How about instead of "meeting course objectives" to "augmenting student learning"  
Would go around the idea of “meeting course objectives.” “Assisting” added.

Allison – ENGL dept is working on an AI statement. We can encourage individual departments to create their specific statements.

Warren – suggested language: Foothill College acknowledges that Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools are diverse and can support student success and meeting course objectives but can also serve to bypass learning.

Allison – AI working group meets today, and she will share. Share with constituents to get feedback before AS for a first read. To put this in place by Winter quarter.

Robert – we are doing a lot of work reinventing the wheel, has anyone else looked at what other schools are doing?

Allison – Yes, ASCCC did put out a statement last week and we based ours on that.

Faculty Academic Integrity Resources

Language approved.



## Student Guidance for Class AI Use

### Level 1: Closed

**Description:** AI tools are strictly prohibited in all aspects of coursework, assignments, and assessments.

**Rationale:** This level ensures students develop independent skills without external automation, promoting mastery of fundamental concepts.

### Level 2: Restricted

**Description:** AI may be used only for basic instructor-approved tasks (e.g., grammar checking or citation formatting).

**Rationale:** This level provides limited AI support for mechanical tasks while ensuring cognitive work is done independently.

### Level 3: Conditional

**Description:** Students may use AI tools to assist in instructor specified aspects of their work, provided the AI's contributions are clearly disclosed. These may include brainstorming or outlining with proper attribution; AI-generated code to support specific tasks or creative content with clear labeling of AI's role

**Rationale:** This level encourages responsible AI use while maintaining transparency about the origin of ideas and content.

### Level 4: Open

**Description:** AI use is permitted throughout the learning and assessment process without restrictions. Students may freely leverage AI tools as part of their work while appropriately citing sources. AI-generated work may not be represented as independent thought when assessments require personal analysis or reflection.

**Rationale:** This level reflects real-world scenarios where AI is widely used, fostering students' ability to effectively leverage AI tools in professional contexts.

Draft for comments: Teaching with Technology 11/8/2024

Brian -

Comment from a BSS constituent: "I think Level 3 & Level 4 is posing a misrepresentation of policies in professional contexts. Most companies have AI policies now, and a good number are requiring their employees to disclose when it is being used (so level 3, transparency). Others, including many of the tech companies- even Google, are cautioning employees when using AI b/c of confidential/trade materials. So the distinction/rationale it isn't quite as clear-cut as this would make it seem b/c professional contexts might actually fall more in line with Level 3"

Sally -

"Real world scenario" language is a dangerous thing to promise.

By writing these statements, we are providing guidance to learners.

Cas – do we need to have professional context and real world in this statement? This could remove the judgment call aspect

Kimberly – without including more examples here, it's hard to use these levels. Additional examples or no examples should be included.

Stephanie – talking about employment and real world – that's not our job to gatekeep, our perspective is in the instructional realm.

Bob – what is the goal here?

Allison – providing ways for faculty to think about and learn about AI uses in their courses.

Cas – I like these levels; this provides consistency for students.



## FOOTHILL COLLEGE

# Teaching with Technology

Allison – should we include these 4 levels to put before the AS?

Kevin – likes the guidance and the levels. There’s a lot of space for interpretation. Can we provide examples here for these levels?

Allison – yes, and this is where the individual instructors can include that. Allison will present the one-paragraphs to the Senate.

### **3. POCR new rubric**

Sally – received feedback, are we ready to go forward?

Allison and all – yes. This will go forward to Senate for informational and we’ll start using rubric in POCR in Winter.

### **4. RSI, Accessibility, training on the J1**

One of the questions on the J1 “meets accessibility” and we’ve not provided guidance to reviewers on how to determine that. We need to support our reviewers, and to work with FA on this.

One idea is to start with the Accessibility dashboard, and provide a rubric – how to examine the warnings and alerts, etc.

Is this something we want to take on? Is FA interested in engaging on this? This should have a faculty voice.

Lené – we already have a rubric, set by the CVC-OEI. We are obligated to use that. It’s the minimum set by the federal government. That’s non-negotiable, so how can we use the dashboard towards that goal?

<https://wcet.wiche.edu/frontiers/2024/11/07/meeting-the-looming-web-accessibility-regulations-the-time-to-start-was-yesterday/>

New accessibility standards are coming. Actionable by April 2026, if we’re out of compliance, we’re open for lawsuits.

Stephanie – this is actionable now, any student can sue us for material that is not accessible.

Kimberly – how will the labor play out? Faculty are coming to her now wanting to prep for J1s. Is OL the bottleneck for doing this?

Lene - has been working with the deans to help them see the process.

Accessibility is technical. We need to take the big 7 more seriously, but we need more people to get faculty’s courses assessed. <https://www.asccc.org/events/2023-big-7-online-course-accessibility-basics>

Lene – we’d like to have an accessibility check before a course is taught.

Allison – so we’re looking for FA agreement on how to do this process. J1s are happening now and we don’t have a process in place.



## FOOTHILL COLLEGE

# Teaching with Technology

Lene – I'd be worried if OL is NOT part of the accessibility check; we want to identify the errors and make sure they get fixed.

Pia – we're not checking the entire course in a J1. Just getting a snapshot. Confused as to what is being asked of a J1 evaluator in terms of accessibility.

Allison – 1) we're open to lawsuits; 2) – the J1 is supposed to be a one-week snapshot

Helen – dashboard is an accessibility snapshot of the entire course – quick and easy to see.

### **Online Learning updates**

RSI - Lené

We are completing RSI Session I - Asynch first section, second section starting.

The next RSI Session II (Culture Pods) will start in Winter; we will offer more workshops in Winter too.

We'll have a small cohort of RSI Session I - Asynch in Winter.

Culture Pods scheduling process was difficult. Faculty are getting compensated. OL did not get any extra budget for this work.

On the horizon:

Looking at Kahn Academy's tutoring tool

Looking at an alternative to Flip Grid – Harmonize

Hoping to do a further pilot of Rumi in Winter or Spring.

Allison: Share the AI language to your constituents – we want feedback!