

Academic Misconduct Reporting Assessment

Faculty Survey Report Spring 2023

Summary

The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) conducted a survey of faculty in Spring 2023 to assess faculty's experience with the conduct process and identify areas of improvement. Faculty were asked if they had encountered student academic misconduct and, if so, if they had submitted an incident report to the OSC. If they had encountered misconduct but hadn't submitted a report, they were asked a series of questions to explore why they hadn't reported. If they had submitted a report, they were asked a separate series of questions to assess their satisfaction with the OSC's communication, actions, outcomes, and overall experience with the conduct process. In summary, communication, fairness, and overall experience were rated the highest. Satisfaction with the outcome of the conduct process was rated lower. The ratings and narrative responses indicated several areas that could use improvement. Recommendations and next steps for improvement are detailed at the end of this report.

Survey Results

Question #1: Have you encountered Academic Dishonesty by students at Sacramento State? ($n = 67$)

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

Question #2: Have you ever submitted an academic dishonesty incident report to the Office of Student Conduct? ($n = 67$)

- Yes: 84%
- No 16%

Of the faculty who replied that they HAD encountered academic dishonesty but had NOT submitted an incident report to the Office of Student Conduct, this is how they replied to the follow-up questions:

Question #3: Are you aware that all incidents are required to be reported? ($n = 6$)

- Yes: 50%
- No: 50%

Question #4: Do you know where the form is to submit an incident report? ($n = 6$)

- Yes: 17%
- No: 83%

Question #5: What factors stopped you from submitting an incident report?

- I didn't know what the consequences to the student would be and it did not merit more than an intervention from me as the professor. I also did not want to engage in a protracted administrative process if the student decided to challenge the accusations.
- couldn't definitively prove it and didn't think admin would support me
- Student agreed to a re-submission
- time
- One case was somewhat ambiguous and related to ai and new technology, and the second case was clearly not understanding by the student of how to avoid plagiarism.
- The process is not clear, the impression I have is that there is an extreme burden on the professor to prove the misconduct, and then argue that the misconduct is worth reporting. In the past, I have been discouraged from reporting infractions such as copying from a neighbors exam.

Question #6: Is there anything the Office of Student Conduct could do to support you in submitting an Incident Report in the future?

- be more clear about what the next steps and consequences are likely to be
- Just need to know the procedure; I am an adjunct professor.
- more present
- Clarify how to identify ai related misconduct.
- Provide faculty with examples of report(s) and what the process looks like (like a flow chart) for common student misconduct issues.

Note: *The following questions were asked only of the faculty who replied that they had submitted an incident report to the Office of Student Conduct.*

Question #7: How would you rate the communication you received from the Office of Student Conduct? ($n = 52$)

Rating	Percentage
--------	------------

Excellent	35%
Very good	29%
Good	10%
Fair	13%
Poor	13%

Question #8: How would you rate your satisfaction with the action(s) taken by the Office of Student Conduct? (*n* = 53)

Rating	Percentage
Very satisfied	38%
Somewhat satisfied	19%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26%
Somewhat dissatisfied	11%
Very dissatisfied	6%

Question #9: How would you rate your satisfaction with the outcome(s) of the conduct process? (*n* = 53%)

Rating	Percentage
Very satisfied	30%
Somewhat satisfied	19%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30%
Somewhat dissatisfied	15%
Very dissatisfied	6%

Question #10: How fair did you feel that the Office of Student Conduct was in their handling of the incident? (*n* = 51)

Rating	Percentage
Very fair	41%

Somewhat fair	22%
Neutral	33%
Somewhat unfair	2%
Very unfair	2%

Question #11: Did you encounter any challenges or difficulties during the incident process?

- Yes: 23%
- No: 77%

Question #12: If so, please describe.

- Student refuse to admit wrong doing. Challenging to find evidence of students submitting AI generated text
- I would like more consultation and training before submitting a report
- Do not feel that there is transparency on what happens after you submit a report (and the differences between the faculty options for followup)
- Student not understanding what they did was inconsistent with the Academic Honesty Policy.
- I was shocked and uncomfortable that the student conduct office sent a letter to the student saying that Ify, using my first and last name, had reported them. I wish they had told me they were going to do that.
- One of my students appeared to have issues in multiple courses but the report I received only indicated a one-time issue.
- The CSUS Academic Honesty Policy was last updated in 2021 and contains nothing about AI usage.
- I wished for a stronger response that would leave me exposed to students retaliation
- Not sure how specific I was supposed to be in the detailing of the incident.
- It seems like the Office of Student Conduct does not take academic misconduct seriously. Reporting does not seem useful or worth the effort.
- I clearly identified the use of AI and the office said it could not be proven.

Question #13: Would you recommend the Office of Student Conduct to other faculty members who may need to report incidents of academic dishonesty? (*n* = 48)

- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

Question #14: Why or why not?

- because I feel that academic misconduct at least needs to be lodged.
- Only action taken was to require the student to write an essay in which he blamed his plagiarism on me.
- Maintain records on cheating
- they are there to help
- They are helpful in discussing the situation. It is also policy to report it.
- there are our only resource for broader enforcement
- Very helpful for email questions
- It allows a third-party to examine the case, and also provide disciplinary education that faculty do not have time to engage in.
- Reporting ensures academic honesty across campus
- The handling of the incidents I have reported has been prompt and professional. Students come away from it learning a lesson but not feeling beat up by the process.
- It is important that students recognize 1) what is considered academically dishonest and 2) that there are real consequences when they elect to behave in an academically dishonest way. The Office of Student Conduct office is sufficiently intimidating even when the issue is fully resolved with simply a Notice of Action or a single meeting with a Conduct Officer. Without the Conduct Office, there is no way to uphold the Academic Honesty Policy at the university.
- we need this process but don't think students get enough punishment honestly. seems like counseling and it's no big deal.
- In fairness to all students, cheating must be reported. I found the reporting process to be easy but it was made easy because I was able to speak with Tom Carroll before making my official report. He helped me to understand the process and necessity of reporting
- Because there are few/no other options.
- If there is a grade penalty, we must report to follow policy. Also, students often have multiple incidents, which cannot be addressed if not reported.
- Other instructors will be able to focus on teaching, while the Office of Student Conduct will focus on academic dishonesty cases. In the beginning, the instructor has to document and complete paperwork for the Office of Student Conduct to

do their part - but once this is done, an instructor can return to teaching and feels supported in doing so.

- Required by policy
- Student dishonesty must be reported
- Because macro-level records of student misconduct need to be kept, so patterns can be identified
- cuz it's simple.
- I thought it was policy that we HAD to report incidents of academic dishonesty? I'm confused by the question.
- Feedback has always been timely and OSC's approach to dealing with alleged misconduct has been student-centered in my experience.
- Too lenient on students who have co ceased to cheating.
- Communication was poor and the process was time-consuming.
- It does not make a ton of sense to handle it on our own. If this is a pervasive pattern for an individual student, we would never know and so being lenient (which would be my preference over punitive action) would be risky. I appreciate the assistance from the office, I wish there was more we could do regarding the use of AI to build a culture of integrity.
- It is the best way to report academic dishonesty
- It's the process I was advised to take when I come across issues. I will advise the same if asked by any colleagues.
- Cases of academic dishonesty are extraordinarily high at Sacramento State
- I don't know what good it does to report, other than as CYA for a grade appeal
- The office does not seem to take the faculty seriously. The reporting process is very time consuming.
- Every faculty should report to create records and identify repeat offenders
- The ease of the process and assistance.
- it's the only way create a paper trail of the students actions
- it is important to have records of student dishonesty
- Because a centralized collection of cheating reports is the only way to catch repeat offenders
- A smooth and supportive experience dealing with an unfortunate issue in my course.

Question #15: How would you rate your overall experience with the Office of Student Conduct during the process? (*n* = 47)

Rating	Percentage
--------	------------

Excellent	36%
Very good	23%
Good	21%
Fair	15%
Poor	4%

Question #16: Is there anything that the Office of Student Conduct could have done differently to improve your experience during the conduct process?

- Better information on the consequences
- Outreach to faculty so that we can make better decisions prior to reporting. I often work with first year students and I want them to understand the policy and be able to make mistakes in their writing in a safe space, so I rarely report unless it happens in the final portfolio.
- maybe a phone conversation? the communication feels a bit too distant/removed for such an important and serious issue.
- More transparency about what happens with reports, how they affect student. Would love to see affirming messages for students in addition to punishments
- Perhaps periodically send out a reporting primer, with FAQs and an example of a thorough report, plus details of the process.
- It was years ago, but I never heard any resolution regarding complaints filed.
- When these students cheat, just a talking to is not enough. If we report, it's a big deal.
- I would appreciate updates on any incidents I report as well as confirmation that there have been consequences for misconduct.
- It would be useful to know the outcome of any meetings/ additional consequences/ if the student had prior reports. Tom is very helpful/responsive to questions. But I could not answer most of these questions because I have no idea what happened after I submitted the reports.
- Speak to me in person before contacting the student. Let me know that my name would be attached to a letter to the student. I wouldn't have done anything differently, but it would've been nice to know beforehand.
- Be more specific and transparent! Saying a student was "held accountable" is meaningless. There is a reliance on policy language, passive voice, quasi-legalese, and overgeneralization that masks outcomes and dehumanizes participants. These situations are not just fraught for students, faculty are going through a lot of emotions, too! Those feelings are never validated. To the contrary, the

opaque verbiage and terse responses heighten the emotions because how the situation is being resolved by the OSC is anything but transparent and affirming.

- what was the outcome of me reporting the student? What happened?
- They handled the complaint quickly. Sometimes the questions on the form don't seem applicable to the situation.
- Thanks for dealing with such a challenging part of academia!
- I think it would be useful to require all students who are reported to meet with the office. I know that would increase workload, but I understand an interaction like that could make an impression that we take integrity very seriously around here. I don't want to be punishment-forward, but I want it to be serious!
- Take over matters and resolve them without leaving me with the burden of taking final resolution.
- Offering more clarity about how the conduct process works would be helpful. It would be useful to know what faculty can be privy to during/after reporting, and what the purview of the Office of Student Conduct is.
- Differed to my expertise of 25 years of teaching at the university level. Hold students accountable for not just academic dishonesty but lying to the face of faculty. Simplify the reporting process so that it takes less time. Better communication with faculty.
- I have never heard from them when I have submitted reports. But I have been able to handle everything according to the policies and procedures.
- Not really. However, I cannot answer your questions on the previous page regarding the "outcome", because in general faculty are not informed of the outcomes due to privacy concerns. Thus it is impossible for me to know if I think that the outcomes were appropriate.
- No ... the office's attention and support was first-rate.

Next Steps

1. Increase Awareness, Transparency and Clarity:

- Provide more information to faculty about the consequences of academic dishonesty, the reporting process and importance of reporting:
 - Update website to better present this information. Provide examples or flowcharts illustrating common student misconduct issues.
 - Create handout for faculty.
 - Distribute through Senate, ask Provost to distribute.
 - Submit monthly bulletin postings.
 - Track the communication efforts.
- Address privacy concerns related to faculty names being included in letters to students without prior notification. (Update incident reporting form to provide clarity on what is shared.)
- Enhance communication between the Office of Student Conduct and faculty who submitted incident reports:
 - Provide updates to faculty on the progress and resolution of reported cases.
 - Beginning Fall 2023 – create Maxient tasks and email faculty outcome notifications with additional details.
 - December 2023 began including faculty on notification letters from their submitted cases.

2. Training and Consultation:

- Offer training sessions or consultations for faculty before they submit incident reports. (Create and offer starting Spring 2024.)
- Address specific challenges, such as identifying AI-related misconduct, with additional guidance and resources. (Work with AI Czar to start to clarify this as a violation or not.)

3. Clarity on AI-related Misconduct:

- Develop clear guidelines on identifying and handling AI-related academic misconduct.
- Provide specific training or resources for faculty dealing with cases involving AI-generated text.

4. Continuous Improvement:

- Annually review and suggest updates the Academic Honesty Policy to address emerging issues, such as AI usage, to stay relevant.
- Seek feedback from faculty to identify areas for improvement in the reporting and handling process. (Repeat survey end of Spring 2024, then move to semesterly)

- Review Incident Reporting form to provide information answering their participation and notification in the process.