**WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**September 20, 2023**

Attending: Dennis Barbour, Jennifer Arch, Maria Quintos Baggstron, Carlos Bernal-Mizrachi, Tonya Edmond, Tammy English, Salvatore (Tore) Gianino, Armando Gomes, Patty Heyda, Kristina Kieutghen, Timothy McBride, Michelle Miller-Thomas, Gwendalyn Randolph, Iva Youngkills  
Andrew Martin, Beverly Wendland, Amy Eyler  
Guests: Jennifer Smith, Monica Allen, Dirk Killen  
On leave: Kim Johnson  

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Topic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lead</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes on Report/Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Questions and Answers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>T. McBride, Secretary</td>
<td>The Chancellor said his report would be very brief. We have not met since May. Welcome back to AY23-24. The biggest highlight so far is the elimination of all loans. We had piloted this before the policy was announced. None of our first year students have loans. We now have the number 1 ranking for financial support. In the rankings, we have moved from 5% Pell Grant students to 21% Pell Grant students and we are very proud of that. We are very proud of that, and thanks for the work of everyone. There is continued discussion of the transgender issue, which we will discuss later. We experienced a drop in the US News and World Report rankings, but mostly that is due to a change in methods, and a lag in the data. The data do not account for the recent improvement in our Pell grant student recruitment. When that is incorporated the rankings will improve. There are three executive searches underway: for the Executive Vice Chancellor for Administration to replace Shante Boldin; the</td>
<td>The minutes were approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Chair’s Report

Dennis Barbour, Chair
- Nothing to report

### Academic Integrity

| Jennifer Smith, Vice Provost | The Vice Provost presented a PowerPoint on the Academic Integrity process proposal. In 2010 the FSC adopted a policy which was updated in 2014. In 2017-18 a faculty committee was recommended but during the pandemic we took off on this. More recently AI and ChatGPT have raised some concerns. There are also concerns about marked differences between schools. There is a hope faculty would adopt a universal committee and process. There have 17 engagements to discuss this process. The slides present proposed changes with edits. |
| Dirk Killen | Q: when will we get the whole process?  
A: October.  

Q: anything controversial? The process seems like it still may be too punitive; there is some variation in schools; are we going to be more efficient?  
A: We hope that facilitation will obviate the need for hearings; hoping that AICs will help. Restorative justice was removed; not getting through in language that it restores. The University supports integrity; hoping some of the new language helps.  

Q: Will there be an additional burden on faculty?  
A: We hope that facilitation will obviate the need for hearings; hoping that AICs will help. Restorative justice was removed; not getting through in language that it restores. The University supports integrity; hoping some of the new language helps.  

Q: Does this apply to just undergrads?  
A: Yes. If it works, it may be applied to graduate programs. McKelvey has one process so these cannot be separated. We have asked other schools to go through what you go through and see if they want in. The modelling is around current caseload of Undergraduates.  

Q: Is there data on differences between undergraduate processed and graduate?  
A: We don’t recall; Olin has a significant process. |
Chair: there are now searchable old minutes. The last round of revisions.

Dirk: the original policy voted in 2003. Narrative of equity; complaints of inequity. The policy was proposed by late Sarah Johnson, 2002-03 all school effective in 2004-05; Jim McCloud evaluated efficacy of new policy. In 2008-09-10, the policy was discussed, new language. In March 2010: proposed clarifications agreed on by that group. Only minor differences in language, in the Senate chaired by Andy Soebel. Enforced March 16, 2010

Q: why is this not a complete overhaul? Seems like such a big change to hire professional staff.
A: We are not changing the relationship of faculty to process; this was currently being run by administrative staff. We are hoping to create a process where faculty would want to take part.

Q: This may create an additional burden on departments; things could go wrong for different reasons.
A: We will create a template; but could be read differently. We are hoping for is a level of general transparency; let student know what they are in for. Almost an impossible task.

Q: Will the process be different in different schools?
A: As long as faculty can depart from this then it is OK. As long as clear that these are recommendations. We are nervous about this part – goal of more consistency will not be achieved. But we feel we need to leave it in the hands of the faculty.

Q: If hearings will faculty be drawn from within the discipline?
A: At least one from school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Business</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td>Executive session started at 4:44 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take care of action items on Oct 18

Respectfully submitted by Timothy McBride