Members present: Tamra Donnelly (staff), Sweety Law, James Murray, Sarah Nielsen, Sue Opp, Margaret Rustick, Nancy White

Guests: Meena Sharma

Approval of the minutes of 5/1/2014 M/S P (Nielsen/White)

Academic Dishonesty
Members discussed how to proceed in a case of academic dishonesty where a proctored essay did not agree with performance on a portfolio. While policy is in the approval process it was decided that a score of LC on the WST would be appropriate. The faculty will be notified of the incident and may adjust the course grade based on evidence of dishonesty.

Policy language was submitted to CIC, and changes were made at committee. It was passed by CIC on May 5, 2014.

Rustick is drafting the language to incorporate in the WST instructions to reflect the new grading policy.

Proctoring online tests
White asked for more information on what the CIC Technology and Instruction Subcommittee has accomplished in this area. Murray reported that he plans to develop a poll to see how much need there is for the service. White stated that ITAC did not discuss the matter because they did not want to conflict with the work of the CIC subcommittee. Murray will contact Mitch Watnik, chair of ITAC, to coordinate efforts. Rustick will send the research that she has compiled to Murray.

Members discussed the different needs for essay monitoring vs. quiz monitoring. With the implementation of course sharing through CSU Online it was hoped that the Chancellor’s Office might develop system-wide policy. Faculty at one CSU campus has suggested that they would not accept any credit from CSU online courses, but this is not a stance the CSU encourages. CSUEB transcripts do not indicate course modality and it would not be possible to determine if a course was online or on ground. Some faculty have argued that online students are being unfairly distinguished from on ground students; that there is opportunity for academic dishonesty in either modality.

WST Flowchart
The new flowchart prepared by Marie Ibarra and Rustick was reviewed. The committee adopted the flowchart (M/S/P Law/Nielsen) with the addition of language stating the variety of ways the UWSR can be satisfied, and a footer stating date of adoption. The flowchart will be sent to CIC as an information item and will be forwarded to the Testing office to substitute for the flowchart that is currently posted online.

Writing Center
Rustick mentioned that the Provost attended the last A2E2 Advisory Committee meeting and discussed funding a Writing Center through A2E2. Opp clarified that the proposal was made to
the A2E2 University-wide Activities and Programs (UAP) committee, and that it would be for ongoing funding, not annual funding as for EIRA and ECL. Members discussed the history of graduate writing assistants on campus and how that program worked. A Writing Center would be housed in SCAA, with its own director and staff.

Murray brought up a discussion of templates for writing evaluations and mathematical skills evaluation that are available in Blackboard. Other faculty are using them. Rustick is familiar with them and can provide samples. A Back to the Bay presentation was suggested to educate faculty of their availability.

**Planning for 2014-15**
Rustick suggested that while it is very important that students are aware of the WST requirement and the campus has made efforts in that area, there is also a need to develop writing intensive courses. She suggested that the WST could be made part of a required course, using the test to provide diagnostic information.

All members present agreed to continue serving on the committee next academic year.

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.

Minutes prepared by Tamra Donnelly

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Nielsen, Secretary