

June 2, 2005

PROFESSOR DONALD F. TUZIN, Chair
Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Review of Academic Integrity Policy

Dear Don,

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been charged with reviewing the current campus Policy on Integrity of Scholarship, which came into effect Fall Quarter of 2003. Between March and May of this year, a CEP Subcommittee, which I chaired, reviewed archival documents, conducted interviews, and surveyed instructional faculty. Attached please find our report, along with “primary” and “supplemental” attachments.

The Subcommittee’s main findings are as follows:

- The widely-reported deficiencies in processing of academic integrity cases during the reporting period are due to breakdowns in implementation and communication more than shortcomings of the Policy itself. Some of these breakdowns are attributable to the extended absence of the Student Conduct Coordinator (SCC) between March 19, 2004 and February 28, 2005.
- The substantive role of the SCC and the Office of Student Policies and Judicial Affairs (SPJA) in processing academic integrity cases has been expanded far beyond that specified in the Policy. This expansion of duties occurred without notification of or consultation with CEP and despite an organizational disarray that left the Office unable to handle even those responsibilities that were prescribed by the Policy.
- CEP finds sanction levels to be more lenient in practice than those specified in the 2003 COP-CEP shared-governance agreement.
- We find general agreement among members of the campus faculty, administration, and staff that the new Policy is well conceived and has resulted in greater consistency across colleges in administrative sanctioning practices. Communication among the deans and colleges has improved significantly over the past two academic years.
- Record-keeping has improved, but continues to be inadequate, particularly with regard to information on sanction levels (standard, minimum, and maximum) and mitigating or aggravating circumstances. Gaps in documentation have greatly complicated CEP efforts to evaluate the Policy’s implementation.

- Ineffective implementation and perceptions of widespread disarray may be causing instructional faculty to opt out of the formal system.
- Misinformation about existing campus policies and procedures is widespread among faculty, staff, college administrators, and hearing-board members. CEP and the Academic Senate must accept some responsibility for the failure to adequately educate and inform the campus community on academic integrity policy.

CEP unanimously endorses the Report of the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity Policy. Additional CEP recommendations will be submitted to the Council following the final meeting of our full Committee on June 9.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Maria Charles". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Maria Charles, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

c: J. B. Minster
ChronFile

CAMPUS POLICY ON INTEGRITY OF SCHOLARSHIP: REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Committee on Educational Policy, Subcommittee on Academic Integrity Policy

June 1, 2005

In May 2003, a revised campus Policy on Integrity of Scholarship was approved by the UCSD Representative Assembly. The Policy was the product of more than three years of discussion and consultation among concerned parties, including the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), college provosts and deans, administrators and staff from Student Affairs, and student and faculty representatives. CEP and the Council of Provosts (COP) cosponsored the final document, which became effective on September 25, 2003 (Attachment 1).

The policy revision, initiated by the Academic Senate during the 2000-01 academic year, had four main objectives: (1) to facilitate faculty reporting of academic dishonesty cases by providing a central reporting office; (2) to improve consistency across colleges in sanctioning practices; (3) to improve record keeping; and (4) to alleviate faculty concerns regarding what was perceived as a time-consuming, overly litigious process and excessively lenient, uneven sanctioning.

During Spring and Fall Quarters of 2003, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, CEP, and COP engaged in discussions aimed at clarifying the division of labor between Senate and Administration in the imposition of administrative sanctions for acts of academic dishonesty. On May 27, 2003, CEP proposed a revised list of "Sanctions for Acts of Academic Dishonesty" providing for four levels of misconduct, with associated sanctions (increasing in severity from a to d). On June 4, 2003, this sanctions list was sent for review to the COP. It became effective in Fall 2003 (Attachment 2).

An agreement on how to link the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship with the Student Conduct Code was reached in November 2003 and the resultant text, which stipulates that Senate and Administration must agree on a standard list of sanctions, was inserted into section 22.23.14.11 of the Conduct Code (Attachment 3; supporting materials in Attachment S3). A grid of recommended sanctions for Academic Dishonesty (Attachment 4a) was drafted by the Council of Deans (COD) in November 2003 and approved by CEP and the Senate Council in December 2003.

The Policy requires that the Student Conduct Coordinator (SCC) report annually to CEP, COP, and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs "on the number and character of misconduct, the pattern of decision-making (contested or uncontested), the severity of sanctions, both administrative and academic, and other relevant matters as decided by the Committee on Educational Policy." The purpose of the current report is to review the Policy's implementation and effectiveness since September 2003.

Related measures introduced in 2003 were provisions for internal marking of grades (so that administrators can identify grades resulting from an act of academic dishonesty), prohibitions against replacing *F* grades resulting from academic dishonesty, and prohibitions against dropping *F* grades in calculations of grade point average.

CEP's Review Procedures

The CEP Subcommittee on Academic Integrity Policy, which was formed in March 2005, conducted a thorough review between March and May of 2005. The Subcommittee was comprised of the following persons: Maria Charles (Sociology, CEP Chair 2004-05), Kim Griest (Physics), Charles Perrin (Chemistry), Caroline Song (undergraduate student representative), and Mary Woolridge (Senate staff).

Information was gathered from the following sources:

- Written documents on the history and implementation of the Policy provided by Academic Senate Office staff, the college deans, the Student Conduct Coordinator (SCC), and the Director of Student Policy and Judicial Affairs (SPJA), among others. Some of these documents can be found in “primary” and “supplemental” attachments to this report.
- Interviews with hearing-board members (faculty and student), the undergraduate student advocate (“Commissioner of Advocacy”), a representative from Academic Records, former CEP chairs involved in the drafting of the current policy, the Council of Provosts, the Council of Deans, the Student Conduct Coordinator (SCC), one Interim Student Conduct Coordinator, Director of Student Policy and Judicial Affairs (SPJA), Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and Campus Legal Counsel.
- Responses to an email survey of campus instructors.

The Subcommittee was extremely pleased with the cooperation of all persons involved in this review and appreciates the tremendous time and effort of numerous individuals who helped provide the necessary information and documentation. We see this high level of cooperation as a positive sign, suggesting that diverse members of the campus community perceive a common interest in improving the process and promoting greater academic integrity.

Findings

According to documents provided by the SCC on April 15, 2005 (Attachments 5a, S5a), 448 allegations of academic dishonesty were reported to the SCC office since Fall 2003 (101 in Fall 2003, 112 in Winter 2004, 138 in Spring 2004, 59 in Fall 2004, 38 in Winter 2005). The vast majority of these cases were resolved informally, with students admitting guilt following meetings with their college deans. The number of reported cases of academic dishonesty has decreased significantly during the current academic year. One explanation offered by faculty is that negative experiences and widespread reports of procedural breakdown have discouraged reporting.

Disarray in SCC Office

Since 1983, oversight and coordination of campus student conduct regulations has been provided by the Student Policies and Judicial Affairs (SPJA) Director, who reports to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. During the review period, the Student Conduct Coordinator (SCC) and the Interim SCCs have reported directly to the SPJA Director. The SCC is responsible for processing of both academic and nonacademic misconduct cases. Available figures indicate that only a small fraction of cases handled by the SCC involve academic dishonesty.

All persons interviewed pointed to serious breakdowns in organization, management, and communication in the processing of academic dishonesty cases. Problems cited include: long delays in processing of allegations; huge case backlogs; failure to communicate with students, faculty, college administrators, and hearing-board members; insufficient notification regarding scheduling of hearings, case resolutions, and grade reports; insufficient staffing of hearing boards; and failure to follow procedures prescribed by Policy.

Representatives from the SPJA Office acknowledge widespread problems and missteps during the review period and attribute these to two factors: (1) budget reductions effective July 1, 2003, which resulted in the loss of one of four support staff positions and required implementation of a support staff pooling system, and (2) the illness and extended absence of the SCC between March 19, 2004 and February 28, 2005. SPJA administrators report improvements in recent months, due to the return of the SCC and additional resources granted by the VC of Student Affairs to fund a dedicated staff person and additional computer support (effective January 2005).

During the medical leave of the SCC, a number of interventions were instituted by SPJA as problems became apparent. These include development of formal protocols, notification templates, flow charts and tracking systems to aid in processing of student misconduct complaints (Attachments 5b, S5b). A central tool in this regard is the “Academic Integrity Workbook,” which is intended to provide up-to-date information on the status of all pending cases. (JASMON, we have learned, is an online database system that provides only on individual cases.) In addition, the Office of the SCC has recently been designated as an administrative unit separate from SPJA (still housed within Student Affairs). The purpose of this new arrangement, according the SPJA Director, is “to promote clarity of [the SCC’s] mission and enhance its visibility in the campus community, especially among faculty.”

Although some sources did report improvement in recent months, serious administrative problems persist. Our review of the Winter 2005 “Academic Integrity Workbook,” which was submitted by the SCC on May 9, revealed large informational gaps (Attachment 6; the Subcommittee requested all available Workbooks but received that for Winter 2005 only). The Workbook shows 58 reported cases of academic dishonesty for Winter 2005. (This is 20 cases more than was shown in the SCC’s April 15 report, a discrepancy that is presumably attributable to the more recent date of the Workbook listing.) Of the 58 cases, only 18 showed dates when sanctions were imposed by the deans. Our correspondence with the SCC indicates that sanctions had already been assigned but had not yet been recorded in the majority of these cases. Where sanctions had not yet been assigned, the SCC’s requests for supporting documentation from the instructor were responsible for some of the processing delays. Information on dates when grade correction notification was sent to the Registrar, student, deans, and faculty was provided in just 3 cases. The SCC states in his cover letter that the Workbook data are incomplete in part due to the newness of the tool, in part due to a lack of focused effort to maintain data.

Where information on date of referral to the dean was available (i.e., in 47 of 58 cases), we found that an average of 16.5 (± 12) days had elapsed between reporting to the SCC and referral to the dean. This compares with the self-imposed limit of five academic days shown in the Workbook. It is not clear what happened in the 11 cases listed as not yet referred to the Dean. In at least one case, we know that neither instructor nor students have been contacted. Again, one explanation given for reporting delays is that the SCC was waiting to receive “supporting evidence” from the instructor. CEP notes that the Policy includes no requirement for the SCC to collect or assess evidence, and

that this is in fact the responsibility of the college deans. (“The dean shall contact the instructor and discuss the evidence in the case” (Policy, Phase A).)

Other organizational deficiencies reported to CEP include:

- Delays in reporting of grade changes and notification of the final disposition of the case.
- Huge case backlogs.
- Poor communication with the Academic Records office. (Staff in Academic Records must implement grade changes, establish and clear grade holds, and initiate internal marking of grades. We have heard complaints that the SCC does not notify Academic Records of pending cases in a timely fashion and does not provide the information that the Registrar needs to insure accuracy of student records. Among other things, this makes it possible for students to withdraw from courses before cases are adjudicated. The Registrar is authorized to reinstate such students, if notified appropriately.)
- Incompletely staffed hearing boards.
- Violation of time limits regarding notification of hearings.
- Last-minute cancellation of hearings. This is partly attributable to eleventh-hour “settlement” of cases through the deans’ offices, but participants felt that planning deficits (i.e., failure to conform to notification timetables) and poor communication were to blame as well. Hearing-board members and instructors report being seriously inconvenienced by last-minute scheduling changes.

Disjuncture between Policy and Implementation

In addition to organizational problems, CEP has found numerous instances in which the Policy has not been implemented as written or as intended. In nearly all cases, this has resulted in a weakening of the role played by college deans and an enlargement of the role played by the SCC. The most significant deviations from Policy are as follows:

- Current practice is for the SCC to discuss the case with faculty and to assemble and assess evidence (sometimes requesting “supporting evidence” from faculty) before forwarding cases to college deans. According to information provided by the SPJA, faculty members sometimes, but rarely, decide not to pursue the case after discussing the merits of the case with the SCC.
- Current practice is for the SCC to send the “charge letter” which notifies the student of the allegation in writing and instructs the student to contact his/her college dean.

CEP was never informed about these deviations from written policy. As best we can tell, they were implemented in early 2004 (i.e., during the tenure of one of the Interim SCCs). It is puzzling that an expansion of the SCC role occurred during the very period of organizational disarray in which the SCC was on leave and his office was unable to handle even those responsibilities that were prescribed by Policy.

Representatives from SPJA understand these as minor changes in procedure, intended to streamline the process and improve efficiency and consistency through greater centralization. They maintain that these procedural adaptations were implemented with the concurrence of the Council of Deans. A proposal for revising the Policy was submitted by the SCC to our Subcommittee on April 27, 2005, with additional information provided by the SCC and SPJA on May 5 and 6 (Attachments 7, S7). These revisions were represented as attempts to bring the Policy into line with current practice, and to clarify and address gaps in the Policy. Since current practices represent an unauthorized

departure from the Policy, CEP objects in principle to revisions aimed to bring the Policy “into line” with these practices. Nonetheless, we suggest that those proposed revisions that aim to clarify and address gaps in the Policy be considered carefully.

Both the COD and the COP maintain that they were not consulted on changes in procedure and that they did not agree to scale back the deans’ role in the management and processing of Academic Integrity cases. On May 13, 2005, the COD submitted a detailed response to the SCC/SPJA proposal for Policy revision, expressing their support for the Policy approved by the Representative Assembly in 2003 (i.e., the written policy), and registering their objection to practices that result in contraction of the deans’ role (Attachment 8). It is unclear to CEP why the colleges did not object to these changes in implementation when they occurred. Unfamiliarity with the formal procedural provisions of the Policy and/or turnover on the COD may have played a role. In addition, it appears that much duplication of effort was occurring, with both offices sending out charge letters and discussing cases with instructors during part of the review period.

Clearly, it is not possible for CEP to fully evaluate the effectiveness of the Policy at this time, because the Policy has not been implemented as intended.

Sanctioning Practices

CEP’s review of available information indicates that consistency across colleges in the application of administrative sanctions has improved significantly under the new Policy. This is likely attributable to increased communication among the deans, who have been working to increase uniformity in sanctioning practices.

As noted above, the grid of recommended sanctions for Academic Dishonesty that was agreed upon by the Academic Senate, Council of Deans, and Student Affairs in December 2003 provides for four levels of misconduct, with standard, minimum, and maximum penalties specified for each level (Attachment 4a).

Our interviews and review of documents lead us to conclude that CEP and the deans have very different interpretations of the 2003 agreement. Recent communication with the COD reveals (1) that the deans understand “the grid” as delimiting a *range* of acceptable penalties, and (2) that they have been applying the minimum sanction in the majority of cases. By CEP’s understanding, in contrast, the 2003 agreement requires that the standard penalty be treated as the *default* outcome. While the deans may exercise discretion by assigning penalties within the specified range, minimum and maximum penalties should be justified on the basis of mitigating (or aggravating) circumstances. We believe that the following points support the CEP interpretation: (1) the term “standard sanction” would seem to imply a default, or at least a modal outcome; (2) the statement of administrative penalties drafted by CEP in May 2003 and subsequently reviewed by COP includes the following text: “A standard penalty is recommended, and any reduction must be justified on the basis of contrition or other mitigating circumstances” (Attachment 2).

CEP is very disturbed by lenient sanctioning, or any appearance thereof. Based on our interviews, email survey, and informal correspondence with faculty, we believe that such a perception is among the factors discouraging reporting of academic dishonesty cases. Our Committee is unanimous in the conviction that academic dishonesty should be treated as a particularly grave violation of ethical standards, since such actions so directly threaten the core educational mission of our institution. Breaches of academic integrity should not be confused with ordinary forms of student misconduct.

Even first offenses call for punishment and not merely re-education. This is a position that we believe is shared by the vast majority of faculty, but which seems to be at odds with the educational focus of the SCC. It is not clear to us where the deans and provosts stand in this regard. We are pleased that the Council of Deans has expressed a strong interest in meeting with CEP to discuss sanctioning policy and practices.

CEP was not consulted on the following additions to the currently implemented sanctioning grid (Attachment 4b):

- A provision that defines any academic dishonesty as “simple” when less than 34% of material is copied or plagiarized.
- Addition of “other” as category of offense.
- Addition of “reflective paper” and “compulsory service” as possible sanctions.

Survey of Instructors

On March 31 and April 15, 2005, CEP sent an email survey to all UCSD academics. Recipients were asked to express their opinions on the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship, especially the revisions that became effective in Fall, 2003 (Attachment 9; Attachment S9 contains a summary of results).

Replies were received from only 52 instructors, a disappointing response rate. To the extent that they are representative, results indicate that academic dishonesty is a serious problem at UCSD and that instructors are generally skeptical of or frustrated with existing campus procedures for dealing with this problem.

Among those responding, all but two reported taking precautions against cheating. With only four exceptions, every respondent had detected cheating in his or her classes. When cheating occurred, it was reported to authorities by 40 respondents, 38 of whom followed formal campus procedures. Those 10 who did not follow the procedures either dealt with the incidents themselves or reported that laxity of sanctions, threats from students and parents, or the prospect of endless meetings discouraged them from doing so. Among those who used campus procedures, 15 reported being satisfied with the process and 30 reported dissatisfaction. Many “dissatisfied” respondents provided explanatory comments. A few were concerned with the time commitment involved, but the major complaints pointed to a lack of communication from the administration (10), the slowness of the process (5), and the leniency of sanctions (7). No one complained about sanctions being too harsh.

In addition to findings from our formal email survey, CEP has received numerous spontaneous complaints from faculty over the course of the 2003/04 and 2004/05 academic years. Grievances expressed include: an exceedingly slow process, almost nonexistent communication from the SCC regarding status and/or outcome of the process, and overly lenient sanctioning by the deans. We are told that such deficiencies undermine faculty willingness to report cases and participate in the formal process. This is unfortunate, since informal handling of cases precludes administrative sanctioning and tracking of repeat offenders.

In addition, CEP has received a handful of disturbing reports concerning reclassification by SCC/SPJA of alleged academic dishonesty as instead merely a violation of student conduct (e.g., “failure to follow instructions.”) We have not been able to obtain independent verification of such

actions by the SCC and we were reassured to learn that official SPJA policy holds that only an instructor is entitled to dismiss a charge of academic dishonesty.

Hearings

Documents provided by SPJA indicate that only six hearings were held between Fall 2003 and Winter 2005, all during the 2003-04 academic year.

The vast majority of those who had participated in or observed academic integrity hearings (i.e., student and faculty hearing-board members, student advocate, SCC, interim SCC, SPJA Director, college deans) expressed the view that the final outcomes (i.e., the boards' decisions) had generally been fair. We did hear numerous criticisms of the process, however. Most importantly, we learned that many hearings are run with incompletely staffed boards. Although this has generally occurred with the consent of student and instructor, it is a violation of students' due process rights and it is inconsistent with Policy, which requires that hearing boards include three faculty and two student members. We think that this composition of the hearing board is satisfactory and provides a balance of backgrounds and judgment.

Other frequent complaints include unreliable scheduling, poor organization, and insufficient communication on the part of the SCC's office. These organizational deficits disadvantage students, inconvenience instructors, and make hearing-board service unduly burdensome. Again, we assume that many of these problems can be attributed to budget cuts and the extended absence of the SCC. We regret, however, that no one in the SPJA office reported the massive organizational failures or requested additional resources from the VC Student Affairs to address these problems until more than a year had passed.

The Subcommittee heard conflicting views regarding the structure and style of the hearings, with some reporting that the proceedings were overly formal and adversarial, and others expressing the view that such formality is necessary and appropriate to protect the rights of students. Those in the former group felt that the evidence could be more straightforwardly and efficiently presented by the instructor without time-consuming introductory and closing statements and without cross-examination by the SCC and student advocate. Some student sources felt, moreover, that this legalistic style disadvantages students, who are represented by a lay student advocate, while faculty are represented by the more highly trained and experienced SCC.

Record Keeping

To process and track cases of academic and nonacademic misconduct, the college deans and the SCC make use of an online database system known as JASMON (Judicial Affairs Student Misconduct Online Network), which was developed in recent years by SPJA. This system, which predates the new Policy, has been a highly successful intervention by most accounts. Some deficiencies in the system (i.e., needs for programming upgrades) were noted by several sources, however. These include: (a) no provisions for entering information on specific types of academic dishonesty, sanction level (standard, maximum, minimum), or mitigating circumstances; (b) no capacity for tracking of cases (since JASMON displays only single cases at a time); and (c) insufficient technical support for maintaining the system. Additional resources for technical support were provided by the VC Student Affairs in early 2004. It is not clear whether these resources are sufficient to cover the necessary system maintenance and programming upgrades.

Communication of the SCC and colleges with the Academic Records Office (e.g., concerning faculty holds (IP grades), grade changes, and internal marking of student records) appears to be lacking in some respects. Protocols for transferring information to the Registrar regarding pending cases of academic dishonesty and the resolution of such cases must be improved, so that accuracy in record keeping can be assured.

Misinformation about the Policy

Some of the problems described above are due to informational and educational deficits. Many of those interviewed for this review were seriously misinformed about the Academic Integrity Policy, and more than a few participants in academic misconduct cases claimed to have never seen a copy of the Policy. Clearly, CEP must share the blame for a failure to take steps to educate the campus community about the new Academic Integrity Policy.

Some sources felt that an imbalance between the deans and the SCC with regard to familiarity with hearing procedures is disadvantageous to students. The SCC deals with issues surrounding student misconduct on a full time basis, while the deans are required to preside over the hearings (often with no formal training). The result is that some students have perceived the situation as one in which the SCC makes substantive judgments about hearing procedure and therefore effectively acts as “judge and prosecutor.”

CEP has also been told that hearing-board members receive inadequate training (e.g., they receive no copy of the Policy or information on procedures, and they feel that the “orientation lunch” is not informative), and that students are often not well prepared for hearings (e.g., they may be unfamiliar with procedures or unaware that a student advocate is available, and they sometimes do not meet with the student advocate prior to the hearing).

The Subcommittee also heard complaints from numerous sources regarding deficiencies in “campus culture” and the need for cheating to be taken more seriously by students, faculty and administrators at UCSD. The faculty and Academic Senate must take responsibility for some of these cultural deficits.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee finds that most serious problems with campus Academic Dishonesty process relate to failures of implementation. Changes aimed at bringing current practices and procedures into line with the written Policy, and efforts to educate the campus community on policies and procedures related to academic integrity should be introduced immediately. In addition, some revisions to the Policy should be considered by the 2005/06 Committee on Educational Policy, in consultation with college and university administrators. Specific recommendations follow.

Roles of College Deans and the Student Conduct Coordinator

The colleges and the SCC should abide by the division of labor specified in the Policy that was approved by the Representative Assembly. Under this Policy, the SCC serves a reporting and record-keeping function (i.e., receives faculty misconduct allegations, notifies college deans of allegations, and enters initial case information into the JASMON database). Deans are responsible

for collecting information and assessing evidence (including in-depth discussions with instructors) and student notification.

CEP recommends that the SCC enter new allegations of academic misconduct into JASMON and notify deans *and Academic Records* by email within *one business day* after becoming aware of such allegations. While a future CEP may seek to mandate these corrective measures through amendments to the Policy, such measures could of course be undertaken by the SCC in the absence of any formal mandate.

If faculty members feel that they need more guidance in deciding whether to bring charges than that offered by the deans, they should be advised to consult with faculty colleagues who have experience with such cases. To facilitate such consultation, the Committee on Committees and/or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education should work with department chairs and vice chairs to assemble a list of informal “faculty experts” from various disciplines. (Former hearing-board members are potentially valuable resources in this regard.) CEP sees dishonesty in academic work as falling under the purview of the Academic Senate and believes that it should be controlled more tightly by the faculty than should allegations of nonacademic misconduct.

Given the overreaching of the SPJA Office during the past year, CEP has some doubts about whether the SCC is willing or able to accept the limited role set forth in the Policy on Academic Integrity. Future CEPs should consider this matter and should discuss with relevant college and university administrators the option of moving jurisdiction over academic dishonesty cases outside of SPJA, or outside of Student Affairs.

In the meantime, we recommend that the VC Student Affairs take a direct role in supervising the implementation of Academic Integrity Policy in order to insure that the most severe procedural and organizational deficiencies are rectified in time for Fall Quarter 2005. We suspect that some problems in implementation may be attributable to a tendency for SPJA to conflate academic and nonacademic misconduct in defining the role of the SCC, and a related tendency for SPJA to view academic dishonesty as an occasion for re-education more than serious punishment. (We note that the SCC deals with some 2,500 cases of alleged student misconduct each year, less than 10 percent of which concern academic dishonesty. Under the Student Conduct Code, the SCC does have authority to set charges in nonacademic cases, whereas only an instructor has the authority to set or drop charges in a case of academic misconduct.) It is critical to the research and teaching mission of this institution that a sharp distinction be maintained between the Policy on Integrity of Scholarship and policies governing student conduct more generally.

Organizational difficulties associated with maintaining two separate sets of policies and procedures may also be relevant in this regard. Faculty and administration should discuss the possibility of developing a staff position devoted exclusively to the processing and management of student academic misconduct cases.

Sanctioning

CEP believes that it is crucial that the COD apply sanctions in accordance with the shared-governance arrangement that was approved by CEP in May 2003 (Attachment 2). According to this document, which is unanimously endorsed by the current Committee, the “standard” penalty should be treated as default, and minimum or maximum penalties should be justified based on mitigating or aggravating circumstances. This arrangement preserves deans’ discretion but also insures penalties

that are severe enough to send a strong message to the campus community that cheating will not be tolerated. A sharper distinction between academic dishonesty and other forms of student misconduct is key in this regard.

Record Keeping, Scheduling, and Notification

Technical resources should be provided to upgrade the JASMON database in the following ways:

- Provisions should be made to enable the deans to enter more detailed information on sanctioning (i.e., standard, maximum, and minimum) and mitigating or aggravating circumstances.
- Capacity for tracking specific types of academic misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, altering assignments for re-grade, copying test answers) should be introduced.
- The system should be upgraded so that the SCC and deans are able to produce summary status reports comparable to those currently produced via the Academic Integrity Workbook.

The Academic Records Office should be kept better informed about the status of academic integrity cases. Officials from Academic Records should be granted access to the JASMON database and should be copied in letter or email exchanges between the SCC and college deans.

CEP should review templates of letters sent out by the SCC regarding academic dishonesty cases to insure, among other things, that information on grades is not contained in memos. To maintain confidentiality and insure accuracy, grades must be submitted by faculty members using the official campus Grade Change form.

To facilitate scheduling of hearings, a meeting space should be identified and made available regularly for this purpose.

Notification of students, deans, and faculty (e.g., regarding cases, charges, hearings) should occur through multiple channels, including email. If faith in the system is to be restored, it is important that instructional faculty be kept well informed about the status and final outcome of their cases.

The deans should develop and adhere to strict timetables for meeting with students and faculty and for reporting back to the SCC.

The SCC should report quarterly to CEP and VC Student Affairs on number of cases reported, pending, and resolved, the timings of the various stages, final outcomes, etc. CEP should monitor the system by reviewing reports from JASMON, the SCC, college deans, and the VC Student Affairs, as well as information from faculty and students who have participated in the system.

Appeals

According to Section C.II of the Policy, “A request for review of the grade assignment may be directed to the CEP Subcommittee on Grade Appeals. The term “review of the grade assignment” is misleading and obscures the fact that the Subcommittee on Grade Appeals can review only whether a grade is assigned based on nonacademic grounds, and that the only action it can take is to replace a grade with a P or S, or allow the student to withdraw without prejudice. This text should be reworded to clarify that the CEP Subcommittee on Grade Appeals cannot alter a letter grade.

If the COP upholds a student's appeal of a hearing-board decision, this should be recorded in JASMON with an explanation.

Education and Accountability

Senate and Administration must undertake a massive educational campaign to teach students about what constitutes academic dishonesty, to promote student honesty, and to create a campus culture that repudiates cheating. Faculty should be involved in any initiatives (e.g., ethics workshops) that aim to educate students on honest academic practices. In addition, steps must be taken to insure that faculty and administrators are familiar with campus policies and procedures, and to encourage faculty to take action to prevent academic dishonesty and to report suspected offenders. Specific educational recommendations include the following:

- Educational documents should be drafted and distributed. "The Instructors' Guide for Preventing and Processing Incidents of Academic Dishonesty," which was last revised in October 1996, should be updated under the aegis of the Academic Senate and distributed to all instructional faculty. This would include guidelines for instructors, to help them discourage, prevent, and detect cheating. Similar materials should be created for deans, hearing-board members and accused students.
- Students should be warned that cheating is a serious offense that will not be tolerated, and that the faculty and administration are instituting stiffer penalties. When students become involved in a case of academic dishonesty, they should also be advised that contrition and informal settlement may result in lighter penalties.
- More effort should be made to provide adequate orientation and training of hearing-board members and incoming college deans with respect to hearing procedures.
- All students, faculty, and administrators involved in academic dishonesty cases should receive from the SCC a packet of information, including a weblink to the Policy, a short summary of rights and responsibilities, a timeline of procedural steps, and an evaluation form. Faculty members should be informed, in particular, that they have sole authority in decisions about whether to proceed with or drop a case and in setting academic penalties (grades), and that deans have final authority in setting administrative penalties.
- The Senate should establish and maintain a website featuring responses to questions frequently asked by faculty regarding the prevention, reporting, and processing of academic dishonesty cases.

Following resolution of an academic integrity case, faculty should receive a summary of outcomes and an evaluation form, which should be submitted to the VC Student Affairs (and copied to CEP). This will help promote early detection and resolution of any procedural problems.

List of Primary Attachments

1. UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship, effective 9/25/03.
2. Sanctions (administrative penalties) for Acts of Academic Dishonesty, effective Fall 2003.
This list of proposed administrative sanctions was approved by CEP On May 27, 2003 and forwarded to COP for review and comment.
3. Memo from VC Student Affairs on “Recommended Outcomes for Academic Dishonesty,” November 24, 2003.
This joint-governance agreement, stipulating that Senate and Administration must agree on a standard list of sanctions, was inserted into section 22.23.14.11 of the Conduct Code in November 2003.
4. Recommended Sanctions for Academic Dishonesty (“grid”): (a) CEP-approved version; (b) currently implemented version.
This grid shows standard, minimum and maximum administrative penalties recommended for acts of academic dishonesty. Version *a* was drafted by Council of Deans on 11/05/03 and approved by CEP on 12/3/03; version *b* is the currently implemented grid, which includes three revisions.
5. Materials submitted by SCC and SPJA Director: (a) Summary of Academic Dishonesty Cases and Sanctions Fall Quarter 2003 through Winter Quarter 2005 (Chart A), 4/15/05; (b) letter describing new SCC implementation protocols and notification templates, 4/29/05.
(a) Chart A is a summary of cases that was submitted by SPJA in response CEP request for data; (b) interventions were developed by the SPJA Director in response to lapses of procedure that occurred during the SCC’s medical leave.
6. Academic Integrity Workbook for Winter 2005, 5/9/05.
This is a spreadsheet developed by SPJA in order to better track status of all pending cases.
7. SCC/SPJA proposal for revisions to the Policy: (a) SCC letter to CEP, 5/5/05; (b) SPJA Director’s letter to CEP, 5/6/05.
8. COD response to Policy revisions proposed by SPJA, 5/13/05.
9. Email survey of instructional faculty (survey questions), 3/31/05 and 4/15/05.

List of Supplemental Attachments

- S3. Supporting materials to memo from VC Student Affairs on “Recommended Outcomes for Academic Dishonesty.”
- S4. Supporting materials to CEP-approved “grid” of Recommended Sanctions for Academic Dishonesty.
- S5. Supporting materials SCC and SPJA submissions: (a) SCC’s letter accompanying Chart A, 4/15/05; (b) attachments to letter from SPJA Director describing new SCC implementation protocols and notification templates, 4/29/05.
- S7. Initial SCC proposal for revisions to the Policy, 4/27/05 (without annotations).
- S9. Responses to email survey of instructional faculty (with identifying references deleted).