I. **Presentation**

Charles Tucker, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Alexander Rankin Professor, College of Engineering; with Bryan Farber, Associate Dean of Students and Executive Director of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline: “Update on the proposed revisions to the Student Code Academic Integrity Policy”.

A. Tucker opened the presentation with data on cheating and plagiarism at the University of Illinois

1. On our campus last year, 325 reported violations
   a. 2/3 from Engineering
   b. 205 were plagiarism
   c. 94 were cases of cheating (having inappropriate sources of information: on your hand, on a cellphone, I-clickers)

2. In a 1964 study by William Bowers, three fourths of students had engaged in one or more instances of academic dishonesty. A 1997 follow-up study showed a modest increase overall, but a strong increase in collaborative cheating.

3. In a 2005 study, 82% of faculty versus 32% of students thinks that working with other students on an assignment when asked for individual work is “moderate or serious cheating.”

B. Tucker reviewed a proposed revision of the academic integrity portion of the Student Code, developed by a Task Force on Academic Integrity appointed by Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Renee Romano; the procedure for revision involves campus-wide discussion, then review by the Conference on Conduct Governance, with final approval by the Chancellor. Broadly, the proposed revision has not changed the process for dealing with cases of cheating, plagiarism, etc., but the language has been revised and rearranged to make the process easier to understand. Some changes to the Code include:

1. Omitted requirement that an instructor must declare that no sale or distribution of copyrighted course materials is allowed.
2. Provided a basis for instructors to determine if a student has violated academic integrity rules: “more probably true than not true.” The existing Code is silent on this point.
3. Provided a single description of the appeal hearing process at both department and college levels. All appeal committees have student members, as well as faculty members.
4. If multiple students are accused in a case that’s intertwined, their appeals can be reviewed in a single hearing.
5. Dean’s designee presides over appeals hearing and during deliberation, with student representatives on hearing committee.

Geil asked why the appeals committees are made up differently in a department (2 faculty, 1 student) than in a College (2 faculty, 1 student, plus Dean or designee who acts as non-voting Chair). Farber said that reflects the current code, but that the task force will be happy to review the issue.

C. Code is open thru Oct. 31 for review and comment; available at (http://www.senate.illinois.edu/ep/ac_integ_policy.pdf). Task force will reconvene in November to review comments and modify code, and submit for remaining approval process.

Ash asked if a faculty member could conclude that a C student is probably cheating if he suddenly gets an A. Tucker said there is no case law, but the process involves the student in the decision without violating a student’s privacy rights. Miller asked if the record is held only in the department. Tucker said not just dept., but college; also transmitted to campus as part of the student’s disciplinary record, NOT academic record. Student must authorize any release of this information, which is typically requested for security clearance, med/law school application. Six year retention of the record.

D. Structure of the process has not changed:
   1. Instructor suspects cheating, investigates, makes written allegation to student with reasoning/evidence and invites them to respond with reasoning/evidence, (*email communication is appropriate and is encouraged).
   2. Instructor makes a Finding of Fact and assesses a penalty
      a. warning letter only
      b. reduced or failing grade on the assignment
      c. reduced grade in the course
      d. educational sanctions, such as attending an Ethics In Action course or doing extra assignments. This option is new, and gives the instructor more flexibility in dealing with the student.
      e. failing grade in the course – this is the most severe penalty an instructor can apply
      f. instructor can recommend suspension or dismissal from UI, but cannot impose this penalty themselves. This initiates an automatic college-level appeal hearing, and ultimately a hearing before the Senate Committee on Student Discipline. That committee can suspend or dismiss a student.
   3. Instructor provides his decision in writing, the student accepts OR appeals:
a. Appeal request deadline changed from 15 days to 5 days
b. Appeal hearing is held in the department responsible for the course, except that failing grades and recommendations for suspension/dismissal are heard by a college committee.
c. There are no further levels of appeal.

4. Registration is frozen during case; so student can’t drop a class after being accused. (If at the time of the accusation the student had a right to drop the class (first 8 weeks), and the penalty wasn’t as severe as a failing grade, the student may drop afterward. If the penalty IS a failing grade in the course, the student is not allowed to drop the course after the fact. Regardless, a formal report is on file in the student’s record.)

E. The appeal hearing:
   1. Review of specific appeal criteria; not a complete de novo hearing of the case.
   2. Committee members may uphold the original finding and penalty, uphold the finding but reduce the penalty, or find that the student did not violate academic integrity rules.
   3. The revised code provides a clear process for cases where the appeals committee and the instructor cannot agree. The department executive officer or dean may return the case to the committee for reconsideration of specific issues, if he/she feels that an error was made.
   4. If student is facing suspension or dismissal in a College other than his major, a Dean’s designee from the home College will be invited as a non-voting member of the hearing committee.

F. Going forward:
   1. Intl Center for Academic Integrity at Clemson U. lists 4 stages that apply to the topic; UI is at or approaching stage 3, “Mature”, meaning our policies are clear and frequently used. Need to improve knowledge about code to faculty to see that it’s used more consistently. Tucker advises any faculty to use the code when accusing a student and not “wing it”, both for fairness and to avoid any legal aftermath.
   2. Need to articulate and promote a positive affirmation about academic integrity.
   3. In need of deeper discussion on definitions and values of violations. Equally difficult to control technology based violations (public posting of course materials by recent graduates) and written essays. Tucker said many nuances need to be addressed. Engineering uses FAIR (Faculty Academic Integrity Reporting) web-based reporting process: drop-down buttons. FAIR is only available to instructors in colleges that choose to use it, which right now is Engineering and FAA. AHS and Business are considering adopting the software. Electronic letter immediately sent to Farber’s office after case is finalized. A few other colleges have adopted it or are considering it.

Miller asked about timeline for Romano’s committee; Tucker said new revisions will go in to effect for Fall semester, so final policy must be approved and finalized by Spring. Prior is concerned about definitions: problematic because citing materials is varied and this code does not allow for mistakes; language theories “owning language”; code is itself plagiarized, uses same guidelines as other universities. Francis asked what the process is at the UI for international students who copy a faculty member’s writing outright without quotations, because the student says it is a sign of respect where she comes from pointing
out cultural differences. Tucker said orientation and guide is available. Farber said there is no one-stop shop, but academic integrity is the responsibility of all faculty and administration across the campus and applies to the expectations for each course. Make it part of syllabus. Miller thanked Tucker and Farber, and encouraged the committee to reply with questions or concerns and to provide feedback to the campus request for input.

I. **Introductions**
   None

II. **Approval of Minutes**
   Minutes from the October 1st meeting will stand approved as modified.

III. **Chair’s Remarks** (G. Miller)
   Chair Miller welcomed new members Susan Curtis and Randy McCarthy to Ed Pol. Chair Miller informed the committee that we will look again soon at the grade replacement policy. This topic was also discussed by Ed Pol last spring semester and additional data was needed to determine how best to proceed.
   Chair Miller recognized and thanked committee members Prior and S. Michael for serving on the Academic Integrity Panel.
   Chair Miller reported that she was invited by Chancellor Wise to attend a meeting requested by Lieutenant Governor Sheila Simon on Wednesday, October 24 about “Degree Completion and Preparing Student for Entering the Workforce”. Kuntz will attend in Miller’s absence.

IV. **Provost’s Office Updates** (K. Kuntz)
   None.

V. **Graduate College Updates** (B. Buttlar)
   Rescheduled Graduate College’s Distinguished Lecture Series. Cora Merritt will be speaking this Wednesday.

VI. **Report on Coursera - A report from members of Ed Pol serving on the Coursera Review Committee: Prasanta Kalita, Randy McCarthy, and Bill Buttlar**
   Buttlar reported that a meeting is scheduled for next Monday and he will present the information to us at our next meeting on October 29th.

VII. **Old Business**
   A. **Subcommittee A – Paul Prior, Chair; Carey Ash, William Buttlar, Brenda Clevenger, Susan Curtis, Bettina Francis, Prasanta Kalita, and Eric Meyer.**
      1. **EP.13.10:** Proposal to establish the Jewish Studies concentration within the BALAS in Interdisciplinary Studies, from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
         a. Prior said it is a complex proposal. Prior summarized the feedback he has received into summary questions:
            i. Jewish studies are religious activity and how that fits with a university degree program?
            ii. Is there redundancy with existing programs in religion and linguistics?
            iii. Obligation to provide similar identification for other religious courses?
iv. BA in LAS in Interdisciplinary Studies, not clear what control structure is within the degree? Agreements from depts. to have their courses used, but still a question of who controls that course list.

1. Courses and Curriculum has control, per Carney.

Committee observations and discussion: substitutions can occur per advisor, according to the proposal; the program info lists many religious career purposes; sectarian aspects of the proposal; comparison of course requirements between minor in Jewish Studies and majoring in Hebrew; several issues appear outside of perspective and pedagogical questions: Sub-economy of Judaism, people doing good works versus the promotion of the religion, e.g. if the proposed concentration doesn’t qualify a person to be a rabbi but does qualify him to work in a hospital to do good works, does that disqualify the proposal? There is a cultural linguistics component; course titles don’t generally imply that they are specifically related to Judaism; other universities have Jewish Studies and Islamic Studies programs, like UC-Berkeley; there are a number of classes offered that relate to Jewish and Hebrew studies; history component, shape of the major is not changing largely; a minor in Jewish studies exists; this proposal provides for a concentration within BALAS (in essence providing for the major); could other religious groups demand majors for their religion; Program in Jewish Culture and Society has good resources already and this proposal is good use of our existing campus expertise; more clarification related to the intent of this proposal would be useful; there is an interdisciplinary basis for this program, not a religious basis; what are likely enrollment demands. By general consensus, it was agreed to continue discussion at our next meeting and Chair Miller asked Prior to invite the proposal sponsor to attend the next meeting.

B. Subcommittee B – Phil Geil, Chair: Michael Andrejasich, Brock Gebhardt, Sarah Halko, Stacey Kostell, Randy McCarthy, and Jerome McDonough.

1. EP.13.07: Proposal to Establish a Master of Engineering Degree in the College of Engineering, which can have majors or concentrations per dept.
2. EP.13.08: Proposal to Establish a New Major in Materials Engineering in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, College of Engineering for the degree of Master of Engineering.
3. EP.13.09: Proposal to Establish a New Combined Bachelor of Science in Materials Science and Engineering-Master of Engineering with a Major in Materials Engineering in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, College of Engineering.
   a. Geil said all 3 of these proposals are still pending. The Grad College is making progress on related proposals.

VIII. New Business
None

IX. Adjournment
Chair Miller officially closed the meeting at 2:42pm.

Rachel Glasa
Senate Staff