Minutes January 22, 2014 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m.

Members present: Tamra Donnelly (staff), David Fenesik, Sarah Nielsen, Sue Opp, Amy June Rowley, Donna Wiley

1. Introductions

2. In Rustick’s absence Nielsen acted as chair pro tem.

3. Rowley requested a brief summary of what the expectations are for members of the committee. Nielsen outlined the responsibilities of the committee, including monitoring of the university writing skills requirement, application of the writing skills test, review of pilot program for graduate courses with writing requirements, and the potential change to adopting writing in the discipline undergraduate courses to satisfy the GWAR (graduate writing assessment requirement). Opp mentioned the upcoming faculty learning community in Written Communication ILO Assessment and encouraged members to apply. The Faculty in Residence are interested in reinstating a graduate writing assistant program and FLC participants could help develop a pilot program. The English Department is considering proposing a tenure-track position for faculty with experience in writing across the curriculum/writing in the discipline. The Writing Skills Test (WST) process and University Writing Skills Requirement (UWSR) portfolio process were also discussed.

If a pilot program for undergraduate major classes to satisfy the UWSR is proposed and endorsed by this committee, the timing to have it approved for fall 2014 implementation is very tight. It would have to be developed and submitted to CIC in early spring if it were to expect approval by the end of spring. Discussion of possible campus-wide writing rubrics included speculation that it might not be possible to create a generic rubric, but that discipline specific rubrics might be needed. That is something that the FLC could consider.

4. Nielsen reported on suspicious portfolio submissions that appeared to be the work of one person. At the end of spring 2012, there were four portfolios under consideration. Faculty met with the students. One case has been resolved and the student’s score reported. One student has not responded to contact attempts. Two students have been interviewed and to date have not attended a proctored exam; academic dishonesty reports will be filed with judicial affairs. Two more suspicious portfolios were submitted in fall 2013. These are under investigation. All cases above were from online courses.

5. Wiley reported that she and Rustick attended a webinar presented by Proctor U. She was impressed by their program, and believes that it would be in CSUEB’s best interest to contract with them for online proctoring. Other CSUs use their product and are pleased. Proctors receive remote access to the student’s computer, have webcam visibility, see photo id, take a picture of the student, and monitor the student throughout the exam.

The committee will develop a policy to submit to CIC with proposed language for course syllabi and course data in PeopleSoft to include Proctor U services in a course. It would be offered as an alternative to an onsite proctored exam for students who are not able to come to campus. The student would be expected to pay the proctor fee. It was agreed that any courses
which are currently using Proctor U could continue to do so, but once a policy is in place they must conform. Rowley recommended that ITAC be informed of any policy proposal.

APGS will contact the other CSUs via the avpaa listserv to find out what other campus policies are and whether or not they use an outside proctoring service. This will be helpful in developing a policy proposal.

6. EDLD 6400 and EDLD 8083 have submitted paperwork to meet some of the requirements mentioned at the last meeting. Opp raised concerns that there is no formal policy in place. 09-10 CIC 32 approved a pilot with a report due in spring 2011 from this committee. A lengthy discussion ensued about the status of any pilot approvals. Wiley stated that the indication in the minutes from December 3, 2012 that the MGMT course had been delayed was incorrect. She believes that students in BUAD are under the impression that their course will satisfy the UWSR. Opp said that the form in the curricular procedures manual was developed primarily for the portfolio course and must be updated.

The committee agreed that a policy must be developed. The status of all graduate courses currently approved for the pilot process must be clearly identified and effective dates must be recorded.

7. Next committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 26, 2014 from 12:30 to 2:00. Nielsen will notify the Office of the Academic Senate and request that a room be reserved and arrangements made for interpretive services. Agenda items:
   a. Development of policy for online proctoring
   b. Development of policy for Writing in the Discipline
      i. involvement of FLC
      ii. status of currently approved graduate courses
      iii. updated application form
      iv. proposed policy

Minutes prepared by Tamra Donnelly

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Nielsen, Secretary