

UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Name: *Academic Integrity* 2015-2016

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2

Committee Chair: Bruce Plourde

Committee Members: (list here)

Biren, Gregory		
Kennedy, Samantha		
Mallouk, Kaitlin		
Scarpa, Robert		
Sheppard, Mary (Mollie)		
Woodworth, Amy		
Appleby-Wineberg, Brian		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

This committee's charge is to work with the Provost's Office on the matter of academic integrity by offering workshops and seminars to students who have committed violations.

Summary of Activities this Year:

In the Fall 2015 semester, the committee conducted three workshops (for 11 students) and three seminars (for 10 students). Samantha Kennedy conducted one workshop and one seminar; Bob Scarpa and Kaitlin Mallouk each conducted one workshop; Amy Woodworth and Greg Biren each conducted one seminar.

In the Spring 2016 semester, the committee conducted four workshops (for 7 students) and four seminars (for 16 students). Greg Biren conducted one workshop and one seminar; Mollie Sheppard, Kaitlin Mallouk, and Bob Scarpa each conducted one workshop; Amy Woodworth, Samantha Kennedy, and Plourde conducted one seminar each.

For any students requiring one before graduating, Plourde will conduct a workshop and a seminar in May 2016.

The chair (Plourde) met with Darren Nicholson to confer on points of uncertainty regarding matters of policy, hearings, the variety of violations, and knowledge of violations among both students and professors. The chair wrote a report on these questions and distributed it to the committee.

Finally, the committee at large noted that professors who send RAIV forms to the Provost's Office do not always know the best procedures for student remediation, particularly in reference to the assignment of workshops and seminars. The chair wrote an update to the RAIV form which includes brief instructions for appropriate assignments at different levels.

UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic Integrity Committee, 2015-16

SUGGESTIONS:

One issue that arose in the Spring meeting of the Academic Integrity Committee had to do with the **dissemination of information** about academic integrity issues.

In the workshops and seminars, students regularly voiced the opinion that they were not aware that their actions constituted an academic integrity violation. While professors may have a boilerplate description of academic integrity on their syllabi, they may not discuss what the idea of "academic integrity" means within that specific discipline or for that specific professor. One suggestion would be that, university-wide, professors in all disciplines and on all campuses spend more time in class discussing this matter, and especially how students can avoid committing academic integrity violations in that field. The Provost's Office could make this broader dissemination of information an annual or semesterly procedure.

Also, while professors are generally aware of the policy and what constitutes a violation, they do not always know the best procedures for guiding students. One aspect of this guidance relates to assigning penalties. For example, professors have recommended seminars for students who

commit violations that are less serious, and which should be addressed with a workshop. The Provost's Office could reach out with broad information to help educate faculty on academic integrity procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The committee, noting the discrepancy in how different professors prescribe penalties to their students, suggested that the form (Report of Academic Integrity Violation) include simple instructions which suggest which penalties are appropriate for differing levels. That update to the form was submitted to the Provost's office on March 23, 2016.