

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Board of Directors Meeting**

Friday, November 15, 2013

VU 567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Carly Roberts (President), Josie Ellison (VP Academics), Jarred Tyson (VP Activities), Hung Le (VP Bus Ops), Kaylee Galloway (VP Governmental Affairs) and Robby Eckroth (VP Student Life) *Absent:* Mayra Guizar (VP Diversity)

Advisor(s): Kevin Majkut, Director of Student Activities

Guest(s): Melinda Assink, Provost's Office; James Hearne, Western Front

MOTIONS

ASB-13-F-35 Approve the minutes of November 8, 2013. *Passed*

ASB-13-F-36 Approve Consent Item A- Committee Appointments. *Passed*

Carly Roberts, AS President, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION ASB-13-F-29 by Galloway

Approve the minutes of November 8, 2013.

Second: Ellison

Vote: 6 - 0 - 0

Action:

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

III. PUBLIC FORUM (*comments from students and the community*)

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

VI. PERSONNEL ITEMS (*subject to immediate action*)

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

A. Academic Honesty Policy Review

(20 minutes)

Ellison Doc.1

Josie Ellison, AS VP for Academic Affairs introduced Melinda Assink, Administrative Assistant to the Provost and Secretary to the Academic Honesty Board. Assink said that while the oversight for this committee used to be mostly the Office of Student Life it has shifted to the Registrar's Office and the Provost's Office. The highest number of violations occur in the Math Department. Last year they had 86 total violations of academic dishonesty which is an increase from the previous year. Over time they have found that the number of violations increases and then decreases for a few years, they are unsure why this trend happens. Assink addressed a concern from last week about who can suspend a student. She doesn't want it to look like a Professor can suspend a student, but they don't want the Professor to be boxed in to specific sanctions either. At this point it is mostly up to the professor to decide what the sanction will be. The student always has the opportunity to appeal the professor's sanction. She is revising the code to say that only the Academic Honesty Board can suspend a student. Assink said that the main change to the policy is to move it into the Peabody format. Other changes have been to offer clarity, note who handles procedures and to make it more understandable. She has also added clarifications based on feedback she has received during past grievances. Assink also added in a section about secondary or additional violations because there was no procedure to ensure due process was followed and everyone's rights were respected. The policy they are currently operating under is 3 pages long. A Faculty member created a 19 page document. It is long and very descriptive, but also not easy to understand. The Peabody Format includes bolding headings for the policies with details in plain type.

Definitions

Carly Roberts, AS President asked about what type of “applications” are being included in the Academic Honesty Definition. Assink said that it could be applications to the department, scholarship applications, etc. They will most likely be rewording this section, they were hoping to broaden the policy to cover more than just classwork.

Assink said that the Academic Honesty Board is called together if someone has appealed all the way through the process or if it is a second/additional violation. The Board is comprised of two students and two faculty members. They ensure that no one on the Board knows the people involved in the appeal. They are looking into having students serve for two years to increase training and consistency. They hope to have at least one student who is in the college that the student is part of, but not the department. Assink focused on training at the beginning of this year in terms of legality, consistency and due process. Kaylee Galloway, AS VP for Governmental Affairs had some concerns about the time and training involved in trying to get students and faculty from a specific department. Assink said that the reason they have a 12 person pool is to allow for more opportunities for availability. They want knowledge from people in similar areas (colleges), but didn't make it a requirement to have a hearing. Ellison clarified that the AS Board appoints to this committee and then the Provost's Office selects from those appointees.

Hung Te, AS VP for Business & Operations said that in the AS Elections Board which hears grievances, students are able to disqualify one person on the committee if they have concerns about bias. Assink said nothing like this is currently in the policy, but this is something she could consider bringing. Roberts said this could be different than the Elections Board because it isn't only students deciding about students. This might be something they should think about more because they are doing a detailed job of matching people to the knowledge base. Ellison said that if a student feels that there might be a conflict of interest then they should have the right to disqualify them. Le said that he voted against the disqualification in the past, but now has seen that it makes people feel more comfortable if they have that option. Assink said that she could add a line in the notification to students asking for them to contact her if they have concerns about conflict with any of the people involved in the appeals.

Roberts asked for clarification about multiple violations; she gave an example of a single paper turned in for different classes. She wondered if people would be penalized for both of these or just for the second paper. Assink said this came from a faculty suggestion; she is unsure how someone would even catch this. Assink feels that it would be good to determine who decides if it is one or two violations. Ellison said that they will be discussing this at the Academic Coordinating Commission.

Galloway asked if the violations and the degrees of sanctioning are obvious to students. She would like to know if there is something that lists possible violations. Galloway gave an example of a student who wrote work for one class and submits it to another class. She feels it might be possible that they wouldn't know this action was in violation of the Academic Honesty Policy because it is still their work. Galloway said that they know it can't list everything, but feels that some examples might be helpful. Assink said that they don't like to list out everything because there are always new situations. Ellison said it would fall mostly under the academic integrity in terms of education. Robby Eckroth, AS VP for Student Life said that he has expanded a paper he wrote in a lower level class by seven pages, he wondered if this falls in the same category. Assink said that most faculty would find this acceptable; but just taking a paper, changing the date and turning it in would be a violation.

Roberts sees that either party can appeal the decision and clarified that if a student has been found innocent, a professor can appeal that decision. Assink said that it could be appealed until it reaches the Honesty Board level. Typically it is the students appealing, but the faculty wanted to keep their right to appeal open even though it isn't used often. Any party can appeal for any reason, there are not situations in which the appeals are not allowed. Le said the policy cites itself later in the document, but doesn't say what grounds people need to have to appeal.

Galloway clarified that the chair changes with each incident. Assink said this refers to the chair of the academic department that the instructor resides in.

Roberts was concerned about group violations because it looks as though there can be consequences for someone whose work was taken. There is a good possibility that someone's work could be taken without their knowledge. She feels that it might be an undue burden for people to need to go through the process if they were truly not involved. Assink the instructor can hear the story of a student and not move forward with violations. She has seen situations where students borrowed a laptop from a friend and they had no idea the student took their work. However, there is no way to determine this without it going through the process. Roberts thinks that the person who uses the paper, even if a friend offers the paper, is still ultimately in the wrong. She would be interested to hear more from faculty if this is to deter this type of behavior. Assink is trying to remove the word "punishment" from the document. She is also working on proper pronoun use after hearing Ellison speak on the importance of them.

Policy

Roberts asked for more definition in #1 of what it means to "be a party to a claim".

Assink said that occasionally students call the office to say they observed someone cheating and try to report it, but there isn't anything in the policy that allows for this. At this point Assink just refers them to the professor. Galloway thinks that notifying the professor is a good tactic because then the professor can observe for further behavior. Roberts thinks that students should have an avenue to report. She said that there has been some talk of an honor code, in which students sign an agreement not to cheat and then to report if they observe cheating. This is a peer enforced code, which is sometimes run through the student government. Te suggested possible use of SHARE training. [An online training system with quizzes to show that students have learned the material.] Eckroth said tried to use SHARE as an emergency management training tool and found there was resistance to it. Roberts said that there is resistance to mandatory online training such as SHARE because there are many people trying to utilize it. #3 Roberts asked if a student would able to apply for a hardship withdrawal. Assink said that they would not be granted a withdrawal if they are in the grievance process. However if an appeal is thrown out then they will be granted the withdrawal. Roberts would like to see some way to hold a person accountable without unduly punishing them. Eckroth feels that someone could have chosen to cheat because of a hardship, this doesn't make it acceptable but it should still be addressed and listened to. Roberts feels it is important to have something like this in the policy to prevent people from just withdrawing to try to clean the slate. Assink said that Academic Honesty doesn't go into a student's records at all. Assink said that many students will try to drop the class before the office even gets the paperwork, but they don't want the student to avoid going through the process.

#4 Roberts feels that it is a little confusing. Assink said they are working on the wording on this and also including more information about the procedures.

Assink said that currently students contact the Secretary of the Academic Honesty Board, once they have been charged with dishonesty because they want to know what to do. Assink can tell them how to go through the process, but not what to do. Ted Pratt and Michael Sledge can't really counsel on what they can do either. She wonders is there a student that can provide this service. She also sometimes gets calls from parents. Le feels that the VP for Academic Affairs could give some advice on this. Kevin Majkut, Director of Student Affairs, said that there have been people in the past that have contacted the VP for Academic Affairs or the AS Legal Information Center, but there is no set process. Eckroth feels it should be up to each position holder if they provide this service, because it might be out of their comfort zone. Roberts would be hesitant to instruct them to contact these positions. Majkut was involved with this process for ten years, a long time ago, and it creates a dilemma because people treat the student they are talking to a lawyer in asking how to structure information to present it, etc. Typically when they say student advocate it is someone to be supportive, not someone to represent the student. He is not sure how to do this, but feels that someone could be appointed to this role for

students. He feels it might almost be better to have a staff person like an Academic Advisor, Counseling Center or Student Outreach Services staff who could provide support for the student and help them to not feel so alone. Eckroth wondered if there was someone available in the Counseling Center who knows a little more about Academic Policies.

Academic Procedure

Galloway would like to see “student” added in front of email because not all people check their student email all of the time. Roberts would like to remove contacting in person and leave it with just email. Galloway suggested adding to #3 that it is required of the professor to meet with the student and possibly have consequences for a professor not meeting with them.

Le asked for clarity on “non-speaking support person” Assink has seen a student have someone there for support, that does not speak and a professor might bring someone to take notes.

Roberts was glad to see this in the policy because it creates accountability and can add some comfort to an uncomfortable situation. Assink said that the faculty asked to add this.

#4 Galloway is concerned about why the instructor has the ability to decide on the sanction.

She feels the instructor might be too close to the situation to give an unbiased sanction. She also wanted to ensure that the student gets a say before the sanction is given. Assink has seen an instructor go into a meeting with a student and have already written the violation form and sanction. There have been instructors that didn’t know they could change it. Assink would like the student to have the opportunity to explain before there is a sanction. She thinks quite often it is an F on the paper or in the course. If they don’t want to give a sanction it would go to the Academic Integrity program. Le said that it creates an odd dynamic because the professor has a lot more control in that situation than a third party person.

Assink requested that the Board review the eform that she created to suggest improvements.

There are two forms, student and instructor initiated. She is concerned because she doesn’t feel that every student might know how to utilize eforms. At this point she sends out PDFs of the eform to the students.

Academic Appeals Procedure

#5 Roberts clarified that the chair/director has the ability to accept or reject an appeal. Roberts clarified that there are not guidelines for grounds for rejecting an appeal. She feels that this might need more clarity. Roberts suggested creating a flow chart about the process because she has found it confusing. Roberts feels that if a student wants to appeal the decision this should be something that happens and should be forwarded to a body instead of one person.

#11 She is concerned that there is no exceptions to missing the appeal or process for explaining the absence.

Addressing Additional Violations Procedure

1 Roberts found the note to be unclear.

#2 Roberts is confused as to what subsequent violation means. She thinks that these two things could be added to the definitions at the beginning.

#5 Galloway was curious as to why the instructor is not required at the second hearing. Assink said that a second violation is a sanction hearing often the students don’t realize this. Any second violation could result in dismissal. The instructor is encouraged to attend. Sometimes instructors say that they included all information in the violation packet and shouldn’t have to confront the student again. Le asked who has the burden of proof in this situation. Assink feels that the student has the burden, but really everyone involved gets questioned. Le said that he feels there is a lot of support for the instructor but not much support for the student. Galloway dittoed.

IX. CONSENT ITEMS (*subject to immediate action*)

A. Committee Appointments

AS Election Board

Patrick Eckroth

Political Science

Freshman

Student Academic Grievance Board

Lee Olsen Student <u>Senate Reform Task Group</u>	English-Creative Writing MF A	Graduate
Matthew Hilliard	Political Science	Senior

MOTION ASB-13-F-30 by Galloway

Approve Consent Item A- Committee Appointments.

Second: Le Vote: 6 - 0 - 0 Action:

X. BOARD REPORTS**President**

Carly Roberts reported that she attended the first ElectHer planning meeting. She will be speaking at Bellingham Business Forum next Thursday. She also attended an Academic Integrity meeting, she feels student input into this process is very important. She attended the Washington Policy Center Solutions Summit where she learned a lot and got to chat with some people from the Rental Housing Association in Seattle about how rental licensing works there. The Teaching and Learning Academy (TLA) is developing their big question for the year. There are about 50 students, faculty and staff that spend the following two quarters addressing the question and how to make an impact. The WTA tour will be rescheduled for January for a time when more people can attend. Washington Student Association (WSA) General Assembly is tomorrow and she believes Western will have the biggest delegation.

VP for Academic Affairs

Josie Ellison reported that University Planning and Resource Council is still discussing their role in major planning and looking at courses that are required for majors. Viking Landing, an opportunity for students to access academic advising based around GURs and which classes to take, occurred and about 70 students attended. An assessment is occurring to determine which competencies are used in which departments and which classes. The Festival of Scholarship has been moved 2014/2015. Academic Coordinating Commission is talking about online course evaluations and the possible expansion of Viking Launch, which is a week-long class that occurs before school begins freshman year. Ellison will be proposing a topic for the Legislative Agenda at the WSA about academic advising and critical transitions and hopefully will be getting funding from the state for it.

VP for Activities

Jarred Tyson reported that the Club Hub is finishing the last touches on the AS Club Connect event at Wade King Recreation Center to talk about recruitment retention, collaboration, and other club information. Last night Joanne Demark asked for speakers for her leadership class. Roberts said some inspirational words to inspire the generations. The Athletic Director Search committee is looking at the job description and role of the position. Student Publication's Council is looking at applications for editors in chief for student publications. Departmentally Related Activities Council (DRAC) had an orientation meeting, this was the first time and was a great thing for the committee. They discussed the purview of DRAC in relationship to the Services & Activities Fee and its committee. Activities Council didn't meet this week, but they will be having a tablet training session to see how they can structure tablet use. They are collecting info from clubs about what kind of information they want to see from OrgSync added to MyWestem.

VP for Business & Operations

Hung Le reported that he, the AS Business Director, the AS Personnel Director, and Kevin Majkut talked about the Salary Determination Policy. A divestment meeting occurred this past week and they decided what structure they want as a study group used to present to the AS BOD. Their report should be presented by mid-winter quarter. Personnel Committee will be

hearing the job description for the local liaison. Le is also working with the Assessment Coordinator about how to include Board Members in Structure and Program Advisory Committee (SPAC) process before it gets to recommendation stage.

VP for Governmental Affairs

Kaylee Galloway reported that approximately 1,200 students used the ballot box. Joseph Levy, AS Local Liaison and Galloway attended the County Council meeting where two folks were re-elected and two who were elected were new to their position which means there will be new faces on the council. At the meeting, a lot of focus was directed towards the building of the new jail. The only new news on the subject is that they approved the transferring of funds if the proposal passes. She is interested to see what the Local Liaison and AS role will be with the County Council. Galloway attended the WA Policy Center Solutions Summit, she was grateful for the opportunity, and grateful to the WPC, the Western Foundation, and Daniel Mead Smith. Western Votes just elected a new executive board member. Nina Olivier and Galloway met to discuss the Environmental Club Presidents Council and they are interested in becoming more legislatively involved. They are currently discussing the possibility of an Environmental Lobby Day, a small scale lobby trip. They are putting forth issue proposals for the Legislative Agenda and are looking at creating an environmentally based agenda. Kudos to Graham Marmion for putting on the first ElectHer planning committee meeting. The WSA board and general assembly meeting will be tomorrow.

VP for Student Life

Robby Eckroth reported that at Campus Health and Safety Committee two brave first year student came to address their concerns about the lack of lighting on campus and the committee was receptive. They will also look reallocating some of their funding and also looked at simple things like cleaning out the spheres and looking at LED lighting. The C lots have LED lighting now. LAC is also focused on this well. They are looking into having this be a Green Energy Fee (GEF) grant. These students are also interested in joining Associated Students Transportation Advisory Committee (ASTAC), who will also be focusing on this issue. The GEF committee was canceled to give more time to students to work on project proposals. The Alternative Transportation Fee (ATF) committee met and decided that they are going to look into the south campus shuttle. Kay McMurren will look at what it is going to cost for Geographic Information Systems (GIS), a mapping program to help collect data. Galloway will be working with Joseph Levy, AS Local Liaison about (Mayor's Neighborhood Advisory Committee) MNAC and start communicating with neighborhood associations.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 4:47 P.M.