

Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)
September 16, 2020
Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Issues and Best Practices Around Academic Integrity, Scholastic Dishonesty, and Online Learning; Academic Integrity - Plagiarism Module Update]

PRESENT: Kenneth Leopold (chair), Zornitsa Keremidchieva, Susan O'Conner-Von, Bibhudutta Panda, Peter Haeg, Tracene Marshall, Caitlin Federici, Caroline Bender, Florina Grigore, Hannah Holmberg, Emily Kurtz, Sharon Dzik, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn

REGRETS: Sara Johnson

ABSENT: Daniela Orza

GUESTS: Bob Rubinyi, senior analyst for online learning, Center for Educational Innovation (CEI); Annette McNamara, academic technologist, Academic Technology and Support Services (ATSS); Lindsay Matts-Benson, instructional designer, Libraries

OTHERS: Katie Jackson, Katie Koopmeiners

Chair Ken Leopold welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves.

1. Academic Integrity and Technology - Leopold introduced Bob Rubinyi, senior analyst for online learning, Center for Educational Innovation (CEI), and Annette McNamara, academic technologist, Academic Technology and Support Services (ATSS), to provide a presentation regarding how the University is best leveraging technology to maintain academic integrity in an increasing online environment. McNamara began the presentation by providing a [slide deck](#) and stated their intent today was to cover three areas:

- Assessment design best practices
- Communicating expectations
- Technology tool options

McNamara continued by talking about assessment design with a balanced approach of faculty development with resources and increasing student awareness of online learning expectations. She clarified that students in online courses are no more likely to cheat than in in-person classes. However, given that the pandemic has created very stressful and uncertain times, these factors could lead to rushed or poor decisions. This is part of the reason why ATSS works with faculty to create authentic assessments, perhaps going beyond quizzes and exams with opportunity for feedback and revision. McNamara further suggested that technology can be used for more than surveillance but for learning as well.

McNamara then spoke about communicating expectations to create an atmosphere of trust and communication with students. This can start with putting resources in a syllabus and discussing academic integrity in the first weeks of a course, she said. Other tools that instructors could incorporate include an academic integrity module course or instituting an honor code prior to assessments.

Rubinyi then addressed some of the options for technology tools, including four of the main items that are widely used at the University: Canvas, Proctorio, TurnItIn, and Respondus. TurnItIn, he said, has often been used to check for plagiarism in writing assignments but may also be used in a more iterative approach, allowing students to check their work and learning how to best cite sources. The other three technologies have tools that can assist in assessments. Canvas has tools to change quiz settings so not all questions are in the same order or adjust its availability windows. Respondus is a lockdown browser which can restrict the printing or copying of the exam or limit what a student can do on their computer, including visiting other websites. Proctorio is a service that includes not only a lockdown browser but also adds electronic proctoring and identity verification. Electronic proctoring can allow for deterrence, documentation, and detection of scholastic dishonesty.

Rubinyi then spoke to some of the challenges of these technologies, including the fact that not all students use a computer and these technologies are limited on smartphones and other devices. Quality internet connections can also be a limiting factor. Additionally, students have concerns about the “creepiness” of the online proctoring. Rubinyi suggested that instructors use the technologies that they are most comfortable with as well as assess what might be best practices for each individual student if possible. These expectations should be included in the syllabus so students can be as prepared as possible.

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn asked about alternative testing sites for students. Rubinyi responded that once students are back on campus, it could be possible to use libraries or other sites for assessments. Sharon Dzik asked about building trust with students in large lecture type classes. McNamara replied that they sometimes encourage instructors to use their Zoom sessions differently. Instead of having a recorded lecture during class time, you could send out the lecture beforehand and use the synchronous time interacting in smaller groups. Leopold commented that as an instructor of a 350+ student class, demeanor can be a big factor in trust. He has been recording his lectures which people have liked and offering smaller problem solving sessions.

Dzik asked how this information has been disseminated to faculty. McNamara replied that there have been development sessions run through the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. This includes workshops and webinars for faculty to better understand what is available and what works best for their needs.

Bibhudutta Panda asked for tips in using Proctorio with larger classes. Rubinyi advised that it is important to think about scale. Using teaching assistants (TA) can be a big help, especially in large classes. Faculty could also think about offering the exam to smaller groups at different times. Leopold asked about access to further support resources in administering exams, including people to monitor the exams and possible training offered by CEI or ATSS. McNamara replied

that they could offer TA training like they do for faculty, but oftentimes the issues present during an exam can be quirky and Proctorio support may be the best route.

Peter Haeg commented that this information would be beneficial beyond faculty and students. Staff could use this information in supporting students and helping them better understand their issues.

Hannah Holmberg asked about the process that happens when a false positive occurs during a Proctorio exam. Rubinyi said that the program can report a probability of suspicion which allows for an instructor to choose to follow up on a particular student's recording. This could be something like a cat crossing the screen. Dzik added that they encourage faculty to really scrutinize the entire situation prior to reporting any dishonesty.

2. Academic Integrity - Plagiarism Module Update - Leopold introduced Lindsay Matts-Benson, instructional designer, Libraries, to provide an update on a new Canvas learning module which focuses on plagiarism and academic integrity. Matts-Benson presented a [slide deck](#) and began her update with an overview of the work that has been done and the reasons this module was developed. She stated that she spoke with this committee about a year ago about a collaborative effort across the University to develop this module for students to utilize when they are early into their matriculation.

Matts-Benson continued by stating key ideas and assumptions around academic integrity, including that the work of academic integrity is the work of the University, most plagiarism is unintentional, and academic credibility and conversations are built when you cite other sources appropriately. Some key methods that went into the development of the module were using prior student knowledge to guide learning, understanding definitions within the Student Conduct Code, and constructing student learning through problem-based learning.

Matts-Benson then described the modules themselves, having developed two of them. Module 1 is called "What is Academic Integrity?" and is an overview of concepts, and module 2 is called "Using Sources in your University Work." The goals of module 1, she said, include defining academic integrity and scholastic dishonesty, recognizing examples of scholastic dishonesty, and making connections between conduct as a scholar and academic integrity values. The goals of module 2 include recognizing examples of accurate modes of citation and attribution in a variety of sources, understanding the importance of recognizing and respecting the original works of others, identifying examples of citation and attribution in a variety of sources, and applying the values and practices of citation and attribution to your own work. When students complete both modules they get a certificate of completion which can be shared with instructors.

Matts-Benson further explained that, as of right now, the modules are available to all Twin Cities students. The development of these modules began in the summer of 2019 and much of the case studies and examples were constructed last fall, he said. This spring semester, the modules were launched to a test population where much feedback was obtained. This fall, the modules were integrated into WRIT 1201 and Learning Online 101 Canvas courses. Most recently it was added to the Canvas Commons and there are currently 309 individuals enrolled in the course.

Finally, Matts-Benson explained that there are reflections built into the modules. They ask questions and contain values such as:

- What is one thing you learned about academic integrity in this module?
- Scholastic dishonesty covers more than just plagiarism.
- A lot of issues can be avoided if you just talk to your professor or consult the syllabus before just doing it.
- What is one new thing that you learned about using sources in your academic work?
- To know when to paraphrase and when to quote, and how to cite your work.
- The exact distinction between attribution and citation: that attribution refers to who said something, and citation refers to where they said it.

Panda asked if these modules will be available on other campuses like Morris. Matts-Benson replied that it is their intent for this to be available systemwide and believes that instructors on those campuses might just simply need to pull it onto their own Canvas. She will consult with McNamara on this process. Leopold asked if they have reached out to colleges that offer freshman experience courses as they seem like a good venue for this module. Matt-Benson replied that she has not, but thinks that is a wonderful idea. Several committee members commended Matts-Benson and her colleagues on this work. Dzik added that this module could be incorporated into the Academic Integrity Matters (AIM) restorative justice program.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office