

Minutes of the University Council on Teaching
Monday, November 26, 2018
12:00-1:15, CTE Seminar Room

Attendees: Kathleen Bailey, Jeff Cohen, Sam Graves, Kristin Heyer, John Rakestraw, Mike Sacco, Billy Soo, Ethan Sullivan, Patricia Tabloski

The agenda items of the November 26 meeting include academic integrity, teaching retreat applications, a report on TAME grants, and a proposal from the Global Engagement Committee.

Academic Integrity

The meeting began with a recap of the previous meeting's discussion on academic integrity. CSOM Associate Dean, Ethan Sullivan, discussed academic integrity issues in CSOM. The CSOM has about 14 academic integrity cases per year. The two main issues are plagiarism in non-business, core courses and collusion (i.e., students collaborating on assignments). The CSOM generally allows the professor to resolve academic integrity issues (e.g., 0 on exam or failing the course); there are usually no board or committee hearings for a first offense but professors must still report cases to the Associate Dean. A shadow file is maintained to track offenses; there are not many repeat offenders. If the academic integrity issue was egregious or if it was an offender's second offense, boards are convened. The board follows the standard policies from the University Catalogue. Ethan stated that anecdotal evidence suggests that board outcomes are usually consistent with the professor's punishment.

A concern is the level of academic dishonesty is underreported. There is a need for data about academic dishonesty so we can understand the scope of the matter. One suggestion was to include in the senior questionnaire questions about the student's own and observed experiences with academic dishonesty. Committee consensus is that faculty probably underreport and are unaware of most academic dishonesty. The professor's ability to handle cases may encourage professor reporting. Students tend to confess at the professor level but deny wrongdoing at the board level.

Mike Sacco reported that during orientation, students receive some academic integrity training, but the training is brief and combined with other areas such as binge drinking and decision-making. Students tend to forget the training before the fall semester begins. Parents also need education about academic integrity issues; many reasons for cheating include mismanagement of time and pressure from parents.

Students tend to think that cheating in core curriculum classes is less of an issue than cheating in one's major. A suggestion was made to reframe the curriculum to emphasize the importance of core classes.

Both Residential Life and the Office of the Dean of Students offer an additional response to remediate non-academic integrity issues. For behavioral issues, in addition to having formal meetings with administrators to resolve the violation, the offending student must meet with

a conversation partner from outside of the adjudication process as an opportunity to discuss possible related reasons for the behavioral issue.

Main Takeaways from Academic Integrity

- Best practices (standardized but allow Deans to tailor for each school)
 - Including a list of ways students cheat would be attention grabbing
 - “Cheat proof” assignment and exam design
 - Makeup exam policies
 - Exam proctoring
- Periodic reminders for students and faculty
- New faculty and graduate students/assistants need training during orientation about academic integrity
- Need data on amount of cheating
- What constitutes cheating? Parent editing papers? use of Adderall?

Teaching Retreat Applications

As of the meeting, 3 people registered for the first information session and 5 people registered for the second information session. Suggestions to increase the number of applications include

- Soliciting nominations from department chairs, nominations would receive an invitation
- Distributing email from Eric Owens (previous attendee)
- Discussing the teaching retreat during department meetings

It is not too late to sign up for information sessions, but the application deadline is January 22, 2018.

TAME Grant Report

The committee received about 20 submissions and awarded \$12,787 out of the budget of \$18,727. Four submissions were denied: 3 submissions were not in the spirit of the grant and 1 submission included a 1 sentence justification. A concern was raised that something about the application or website implied the grant process was trivial. Rejecting the application is a good response. This perception could be a product of grants that were awarded in previous years. The committee suggested waiting another cycle before the application is tweaked. Award letters were distributed.

Proposal from Global Engagement Committee (GEC)

Kathy is meeting with Global Engagement Committee on November 27, 2018. The GEC asked that global engagement be a criterion to award TAME and TAM grants. A possible response to the request is to give special consideration to applications in the upcoming year and change the special consideration each year. The effect of this criterion may not change any of the awards because the global dimension may not be a binding constraint. An alternative response to the GEC is to add language that encourages, but does not require, global engagement. Kathy will bring responses from meeting with GEC to the next UCT meeting

Next Meeting — TBD