

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REVIEW BOARD
ANNUAL REPORT
2018-2019**

To the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly:

The Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) respectfully submits its activities for the 2018-19 academic year.

I. Committee Charge and Operation

The primary function of the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) is to convene panels to hear student appeals of academic integrity cases. The Board makes recommendations to the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct (OAISC) and the Academic Senate regarding policies and procedures on academic integrity. The Board also reports a summary of activities annually or as needed to the Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE).

Teresa Dalton, Associate Professor of Teaching in Criminology, Law, and Society chaired the Academic Integrity Review Board in 2018-19. The Board as a whole met 3 times. The Board received 22 appeals during the year, including Summer Quarter.

II. Campus and Divisional Issues

A. Instructor Documentation for AIRB Appeals

(Memo Date: 9/19/2018)

At the 9/7/18 appeal hearing, the totality of instructor documentation for incident reports came into question. This raised questions regarding whether the OAISC submits all instructor documentation with the appeal and whether they have access to Turnitin.com incident reports. OAISC confirmed that anything the faculty submits with their report is forwarded with the student's appeal. It was also confirmed that OAISC does not have access to Turnitin.com incident reports.

B. Statistics on UCI Academic Integrity Violations 2017-18

(Meeting Date: 10/8/2018 & 2/1/2019)

The OAISC provided data on reporting statistics for academic integrity violations. The data yielded significant differences in the few schools that report frequently and all other schools. Of the schools that report in higher numbers, the percent of the population is still far less than what is cited in existing literature. Members discussed that the high number of incidents reported from these specific UCI schools might be due to the tools available to detect plagiarism for assignments such coding. It is possible that the format of exams and assignments for low reporting schools do not easily lend themselves to large-scale detection. There was also discussion about resistance from the faculty who do not want to change the design of their courses around a minority of violators.

Members noted a lack of informational resources available to faculty to address academic integrity issues. Without any guidelines, there is no standard sanctioning model for faculty to reference. It was suggested that the Board collect information from the schools so that new faculty members would know the most frequently used course sanctions in their departments/schools.

In order to foster faculty buy-in to participate in academic integrity reporting, the AIRB discussed possible strategies. Members discussed issuing a survey of instructors on what they do to enforce academic integrity. This would be beneficial to understand what the levels of infractions are and what the campus standards are. Use of classroom photography, scheduling common examinations, and sharing of the reporting data with each school might also be helpful to at least start a department discussion of use of reporting tools.

C. Ethics Workshop Sanctions

(Meeting Date: 2/1/2019)

AIRB raised concerns that the OAISC does not issue an ethics workshop to every student found in violation of the academic integrity policy. Members noted that given the OAISC's progressive sanctioning model, failure to appropriately inform students on campus academic integrity policy may leave the campus vulnerable to charges of due process infringement. The Board issued a memorandum to OAISC expressing that the standard sanction for any student found in violation of academic integrity should include completion of the ethics workshop in addition to any other administrative sanction the OAISC finds appropriate.

The OAISC responded that the ethics workshop is used for both student conduct and academic integrity cases. Topics are broad in scope and do not include specific information about academic integrity. Information regarding the progressive sanctioning model is explained to students during their individual meetings with case adjudicators.

Members discussed whether AIRB should create a course to fill this gap. Doing so may move the burden of the responsibility out of OAISC. AIRB suggested that the course be a course requirement for all students (including graduate students). Issues that were considered included who would be responsible for teaching it and how many credits would it be worth. Members recommended that the course be worth 1 credit and graded pass/no pass. It was suggested that the law school or criminology could take this on given their expertise.

D. Course Material Sharing Services

(Meeting Date: 2/1/2019)

Academic integrity violations increasingly involve the use of course-material sharing services such as CourseHero. Faculty must go through onerous steps in order to remove their individual documents. It should not be at the individual level that faculty must ensure academic integrity. It was suggested that AIRB solicit system-wide support in order to legitimize the concern and enforce consequences for use of CourseHero. Members expressed that perhaps the campus could reference copyright law for faculty protection of lecture materials.

Members discussed a need for campus-wide coordinated messaging regarding the use of CourseHero. Students could be warned of the ways that use of CourseHero could come back to harm the student such as when a student was penalized years later for submitting material to CourseHero despite that the student making an earnest effort to remove the material. Members suggested that perhaps the campus could make a PSA video. The sharing of stories may have an impact.

The Board noted that use of CourseHero and how it is considered in terms of academic integrity should be covered in the ethics workshop. Members discussed

that not assigning ethics workshops to violators could leave the university vulnerable. It should be standard protocol for students who have been reported.

E. Faculty Survey on Academic Integrity Sanctions

(Meeting Date: 5/10/19)

As a result of discussions from the 10/8/18 and 2/1/18 meetings, a survey was created to understand campus standards of academic integrity. Members discussed that the survey should be sent out to instructors in the Fall. Data from the survey will inform AIRB on the development of sanction guidelines. It was recommended that results from the faculty survey be used to support a request for centralized resources. This would distribute the burden equitably amongst schools.

F. Revision to Academic Integrity Procedures – XI. Types of Academic Integrity Policy Violations

Members discussed whether current policy should include language prohibiting the act of using material obtained online. It was suggested that a subcommittee be formed to create verbiage that could apply to all schools. CSU Academic Senate recently passed a resolution requesting that their Chancellor's Office and campuses act on infringement of faculty intellectual property. Discussion about the resolution is emerging at UCEP.

UC Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations and Ownership of Course Materials is the most relevant systemwide policy. However, this mostly applies to faculty intellectual property. It was recommended that AIRB continue to monitor discussions for any developments that should be codified in campus policy.

G. Video Cameras in Lecture Halls

In response to member requests to use classroom photography to enforce academic integrity, AIRB consulted with Campus Counsel for guidance. Campus Counsel advised that instructors should make no statements about a campus-wide recording policy. If video cameras were to be allowed, this may have implications on who can access the data.

Members discussed the case of University of Toronto that has a dedicated office of proctoring. The office trains proctors and deploys them for exams according to class size (about 1 TA per 50 students). Class sizes could be as large as one thousand students. Such classes were supported by an estimated 25 TA's. Such an entity holds the central university administration responsible for organizing exams.

Members noted that campus practice has set the burden of acting on academic dishonesty on the faculty. The administration does not give sufficient resources nor power to effectively do so. If academic integrity is not adequately supported, the grades issued to students are not a true representation of academic performance.

H. Board Issues for 2019-20

1. Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct (updates and issues listed above as well as staff transition)
2. Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures
3. Summer Hearings

I. 2018-19 Academic Integrity Review Board

Teresa Dalton, Social Ecology (Chair)
Rachel Baker, Education
Simone Chambers, Social Sciences
Michael Hooker, Arts
Chong Huang, Business
Susan King, Physical Sciences
Annie Lai, Law
Jung-Ah Lee, Nursing
Anne Lemnitzer, Engineering
Debra Mauzy-Melitz, Biological Sciences
Adrian Preda, Medicine (Clinical Science)
Patricia Seed, Humanities
Weining Shen, ICS
Francesco Tombola, Medicine (Basic)

Ex Officio:

Mike McBride, Social Sciences
Mike Mulligan, Biological Sciences
Gerardo Okhuysen, Business
Samuel Schriener, Pharmaceutical Sciences
David Van Vranken, Physical Sciences

Senate Analyst:

Michelle Chen, Academic Senate