

## Academic Integrity and AI: Meeting with Liz McGaw and OL Kelly

Tuesday, February 13, 2024

SU 312

In Attendance: Ian Gerd, Chrystala Smith, Alisha Ridnour, Liz McGaw, OL Kelly, and Andy Kramer

Not in Attendance: Sondra Petty

### **F!**

Liz McGaw started the conversation off with a bird's eye view of where the State Regents' might stand on the topic of adding a F! to the grading system and it simply is not there and most likely never will be as there are no mechanisms in place for this to be added. It would take significant changes to the state's policy on grading. State lawyers also do not think it would be advisable to pursue this type of policy.

General opinion is that an F is enough.

### **Current Academic Integrity Policy**

OL and Liz shared printouts of pages 4&5 (Student Obligations and Regulations) and 13&14 (Student disciplinary Procedures) of the current student handbook. Liz also brought up the fact the University's policy favors treating these situations as an "educational and rehabilitative approach."

As it is currently written, and has traditionally been written, the policy largely leaves the determination of what is or is not academic dishonesty in context of a course to the faculty member. Christala and OL both expressed the power of establishing communication with the student if there is a suspicion of compromised integrity in the work produced for the course.

One part of the discussion brought up that most students who do admit to some forms of cheating do it for either two reasons: They felt the assignment was busy work and/or low value in the scheme of their coursework priorities or that they had some type of crisis and felt driven to it out of desperation. Early conversations with students might serve as a great deterrent but may also provide more in-depth insight into whether a student is struggling and in need of more support. After initiating the conversation, the faculty member can determine which path forward to take.

### **Maxient Reports**

If the faculty member does decide to push the issue past their course, a Maxient Report should be filed. The forms are a self-reporting tool, they are not mandatory at this time. When a report is submitted, a case is opened. These cases are linked by the student's ID. The Maxient system serves as a repository for documents that are filed. The reports can provide a pattern for students who may violate the integrity policy at some frequency. But to show the patterns, the reports need to be filled out.

No report is viewed as a nuisance, nor will it be the deciding factor for a student getting "in-trouble" in ways they cannot recover from. Maxients often allow Student Affairs to intervene at meaningful times to help a student. At this point in the Spring semester there have been no Maxients filed. There does

seem to be a trend showing more filed in the fall than spring but also a trend in adjuncts filing them more than faculty.

#### The Steps of the Process

1. Faculty member determines if they want to handle the case. The student accepting the faculty members option(s) will make the penalties final and waive any further processes. Potential options for faculty:
  - a. Student withdraws
  - b. Grade reduction
  - c. Redoing test or assignment, or some other academic work
  - d. Performing additional academic work not required of other students
  - e. Denial of degree
2. If student does not agree they can take their case to the department chair.
3. If no resolution found with Chair, the student can then push to the VPAA.
4. Grade disputes should be filed with Academic Appeals Committee
  - a. While the committee primarily acts as arbitrators for grade disputes filed by faculty or students the committee can also act as appeals for students on academic probation or been suspended for other academic reasons.