

Employee Questions/Comments 2502 – Academic Integrity

Employee 1 Questions/Comments:

I am opposed to the proposed changes to Policy 2502 – Academic Integrity on two grounds: structure and content.

STRUCTURE:

This is an academic issue and one that the Faculty deal with on a daily basis. However, there was no faculty input into the revision, we were not privy to the discussion, did not see any of the source documents, unaware of the extent of the problem and most importantly how the proposed policy changes will address those specific issues. Faculty ideas and concerns were not addressed while the policy changes were drafted. Taking faculty concerns and input into consideration after the fact is not the same as being involved in the policy draft.

The general Faculty Council consensus is that this is a solution in search of a problem.

CONTENT:

1. The policy does not go far enough in that it only address student behavior and punishment.
2. The policy does not address the college's role in teaching, coaching and mentoring students into preventing Academic Integrity issues.
 - a. There is not a consistent college-wide program that addresses this issue. FR/FL and Bartonline courses for example, are required to place a standard college description with Academic Integrity questions in the College Policy Quiz in their course shells. Great Bend faculty are not required to do so and while some faculty fully address the issue in class, others only mention it, and some claim 'it's the student's responsibility to know'.
 - b. Troops Schools relies on the Uniform Code of Military Justice.
 - c. There should be a full Academic Integrity training module placed in each and every course shell, in each and every course taught at Barton, with an Academic Integrity specific quiz required for each course. The current system is inadequate when you consider the penalties. The argument that 'not all courses have a course shell' or that the 'student should have known' does not pass muster. It is our responsibility to teach.
3. The Policy needs to include the requirement for a Faculty Training Module that provides Tips, Tactics and Procedures to address Academic Integrity issues.
 - a. The Module needs to address passive techniques such as course design - quizzes with large question pools, minimizing the time allotted for each question or an exercise, rotating/replacing assignments after each semester, etc.
 - b. The Module needs to address active techniques involving software applications such as Turnitin, Panapto, or a Bio-Sig-style log in monitor, etc.
4. The policy does not specifically or fully address the issue of Contract Cheating.
5. There are significant problems with the Academic Integrity Reporting Form.
 - a. This is a major source of conflict within the Faculty Council, and has been for years.

- b. There is no indication as to where the form is filed – hard copy or electronic; who has access to the forms; how long does the form remain on file; what are the procedures for removing the form from the student's file.
 - c. The revised form allows a faculty member to submit the report without actually contacting and discussing the issue with the student or requiring them to acknowledge the situation.
6. The proposed policy eliminates PHIL 1612 course, which allows a student to remove the X portion of the XF grade. I do not have an issue with flunking a student (without refund) for cheating; I have major issues with the 'Death Sentence' that the XF grade carries. It brands someone for life for a mistake/shortcut they might have made at 18 or 19. If you are going to eliminate the opportunity to remove the grade then we should eliminate the XF grade completely and just issue the F grade with 'Internal Use Only' comments that it was for cheating.

Mike Cox