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Prepared by Mark Johnson (Academic Integrity Director)

RELATION TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Integrity lies at the center of our core values at Marquette University and is a central component in the pursuit of academic excellence. Activities of the Academic Integrity Council support two of the strategic themes in particular: 1) Pursuit of Academic Excellence for Well Being and; 2) Formation of the Mind and the Heart. Academic integrity is fundamental to academic excellence, since without it there is no way to determine the excellence of our students. If the students’ work is not their own, then how do faculty know whom they are evaluating? Additionally, integrity is an essential virtue for the development of our students as future leaders in their life beyond the academy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This past academic year was the fifth year of the new policies and procedures and the second of the director’s three-year term. The Director studied and collaborated on the Council’s processes, both because of the need to on-board a new student Coordinator (Tyler Haro) and because at times the workload’s timing and quantity meant that the work just had to be shared.

The year was marked by the appearance of the novel coronavirus, which necessitated a shift to all-online instruction modality during the spring break in the second semester. Student reaction to this sudden change, judging by the increase in the number of cases, is concerning. Cases in the second semester doubled those of the first semester, and the proportion of the type of misconduct nearly doubled, with ‘cheating’ going from the first semester’s 41% to the second semester’s 78%. The remote learning meant remote assessment, which in turn meant a heavier use of the D2L quizzes feature. Even in classes where instructors took advantage of D2L’s randomization features, plus shrewd test-design decisions, there were many reports of student misconduct—a pattern also detectable in online-only Nursing courses in the first half of this summer. The expectation that much assessment for the coming academic year will likewise be online invites one to think that AIC will again have its case-load swell.

The surge of second-semester cases (even a swell at the end of the first semester) showed how the AIC office’s processes do not scale well. With every AIC case defaulting to an average of nine Microsoft Word documents per student, and the need to gather essential data manually from University web sites, and then to communicate with many people via e-mail, the office was crushed to receive, structure, and then process the many cases. An unfortunate result was
slow case-process times, with AIC regularly missing its stated timing aims. A benefit, however, was learning where bottlenecks were, so the Director and the Coordinator were able to design and code key automations that will improve the ‘throughput’ of coming cases.

**Administration of Academic Misconduct Cases**

- Thanks to attentive deans and supportive faculty we have 29 investigative officers (IOs).
- There are 20 students trained to be members of hearing board.
- All told the Council administered 180 cases in involving 170 students

**Fostering Academic Integrity**

In addition to administering cases of academic misconduct on campus, a goal of the office is to promote academic integrity among both faculty and students. This takes place in individual meetings with students and faculty, in presentations primarily to graduate student assistants and faculty in advance of the upcoming school year (usually in August and early September). Highlights of the past year include:

- Numerous sit-down meetings with students as part of their sanctions, to learn more about their mindset, and to explain in troublesome cases the importance of academic integrity. Especially during the remote learning period, the Director reached out to many students via phone and Teams.
- Presentations to faculty and teaching assistants in History, Philosophy, and Theology.

**Academic Misconduct Cases**

This year continued the upward shift of more cheating than plagiarism—possibly because some cases in computer science programming made more sense as ‘cheating’ than as ‘plagiarism.’ Approximately 95% of the students submitted for misconduct were first-time submissions, with around 5% as second offenders. No students were suspended or expelled for Academic Integrity reasons this Academic Year.

The key takeaway is: double. Double the cases and double the proportion of cheating. The fall term saw **58 cases** submitted, while the spring term—the pandemic term—saw **122 cases**.

**Offense Types**
Case Outcomes

The ratio of students whose cases were dismissed, those who accepted responsibility and an expedited sanction, and those who went to a full hearing, varied from the numbers of last year. Of the 200 students for AY18–19, 14 went to a Hearing Board (7.0%), with 10 of the 14
resulting in dismissals. 39 students (19%) had their cases dismissed by the investigative process, and 147 students accepted responsibility via the expedited review process (74%). This year’s dismissal rate tracks generally with last year’s 17%, but the 74% acceptance of responsibility approaches a ten-percent increase over last year, with a conjoined drop in the percentage of cases that went to a hearing board (last year’s 16% to this year’s 7%). Why this occurred is uncertain.
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**Students’ Home College (number of cases)**

Analyzing the students by home college, the largest percentage of offenders remains our largest undergraduate colleges: Business Administration, Arts and Sciences, and Health Sciences.
Reports were filed on 2\% of the entire undergraduate student population (same as last year). The reports filed on business administration and engineering students were also in keeping with last year. It remains true that the largest percentage of Colleges or Schools against which offences are alleged is our largest undergraduate colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, and Engineering.
Number of Cases (distributed across units)

![Graph showing number of cases distributed by college]

**Thoughts for the Coming Year**

In his third year the Director plans to:

- Work to improve AIC office activity via use of the Microsoft tools the University is already paying for (e.g., use of Microsoft Flow to automate repetitious and error-prone activities, such as folder-naming, producing boilerplate documents, etc.).
- Above all, work to make the documents our members use more intuitive and protective from error, via formatting and easy-to-use check-boxes, drop-down menus, and auto-filling. The goal is to allow AIC members to send only MS Word documents (not PDFs).

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Johnson