Members present: Tamra Donnelly (staff), David Fenesik, Sweety Law, James Murray, Sarah Nielsen, Sue Opp, Amy June Rowley, Margaret Rustick, Nancy White, Donna Wiley

Guests: Sally Murphy, Ari Lathuras, Melinda Manzo

Approval of the minutes of 2/26/2014 M/S P (Opp/Law) as amended. 9 ayes, 1 abstention

1. Academic Integrity and the WST
   a. Exam: Rustick received another request to read a WST submission for possible academic dishonesty. Readers will flag a submission if there are facts included, which leads to review. Rustick meets with the students to determine the source of the facts. In one case the student declared that the facts were made up, that an academic advisor suggested that was an appropriate strategy. After some discussion it was agreed that the WST directions should include both written and oral instructions regarding what information should be included in the essay. Wiley will obtain a copy of the instructions from the testing office to ensure that appropriate language is included.

   M/S/P (Wiley/White) that the committee develop and submit to CIC a policy, to be included on the instructions for the WST, that if academic dishonesty is demonstrated the student will fail the WST and be required to use the course path to satisfy the UWSR and that the incident will be reported to Student Judicial Affairs. Wiley will develop the policy and forward to Murray and Senate Office for appropriate Senate formatting.

   b. First-tier portfolio course: There have been incidents of apparent academic dishonesty in the first-tier portfolio courses. The courses have three timed exams, which are unproctored. In some cases, students who have shown poor performance on the WST have then turned in flawless portfolios, including the timed essays in those portfolios. Discussion of how to address these incidents led to:

   M/S/P (Opp/Wiley) that the committee develop and submit to CIC a policy that if academic dishonesty is shown in the first-tier portfolio submission, the student will receive no credit for the course, and may petition to retake. An academic dishonesty report will be submitted to Student Judicial Affairs.

   c. Wiley attended the CIC Technology and Instruction Subcommittee meeting to discuss Proctor U. White is a member of ITAC (Information Technology Advisory Committee) and she will bring the information on Proctor U to that committee.

2. Student Success
   a. Rustick was glad to hear that the Student Retention and Graduation Subcommittee of SSAC will continue to use “WST” as the common language when referring to satisfaction of the university writing skills requirement. She worked with Marie Ibarra to improve the flowchart. The members discussed the chart and whether it had enough information. Opp suggested that every possible path should be included so that all students are made aware of the various ways to satisfy the requirement.
Murphy mentioned that some students take the second tier course without attempting the first tier course, and then petition to have their records indicate WST is satisfied. This is not technically appropriate. Rustick suggested that until there was faculty support for writing across the curriculum the university would not be able to address alternatives to the WST. Opp mentioned that there was still a need to develop a policy for proposing writing intensive courses.

b. Murphy reported that she discussed possible need to engage ETS to address any possible backlog in WST administration. Wiley reported that to date there has not been a backlog, the impediment does not seem to be unavailability of seats, but lack of enrollment by students.

3. Follow up on graduate course procedures
   a. Rustick has not heard back from CBE.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.

Minutes prepared by Tamra Donnelly

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Nielsen, Secretary