

**Meeting of the Villanova University
Academic Policy Committee**

Thursday, April 20, 2017
2:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Fedigan Room, SAC 400

Minutes

In Attendance:

Sherry Bowen, Danai Chasaki, Gordon Coonfield, Jennifer Dixon, Marylu Hill, Shelly Howton, Christopher Kilby (chair), Eric Lomazoff, Peggy Lyons, Christine Palus, Lesley Perry, Elizabeth Petit de Mange, Michael Posner, Joseph Schick, Andrea Welker, Craig Wheeland, Daniel Wright, Dennis Wykoff, Tina Yang.

Absent:

DeVon Jackson, Sandra Kearney, Brian King, Adele Lindenmeyr, Krupa Patel, Rees Rankin, Eriny Tawfik.

[NIA=Notified in Advance]

Administrative Items

- 1) Minutes for the meeting: Jennifer Dixon agreed to take notes.
- 2) Approving minutes for the March 21, 2017 APC meeting: APC unanimously approved the minutes as circulated.

Old Business

- 3) Reports of sub-committee chairs (as needed):
 - (a) Online CATS (Michael Posner): APC has a draft letter for tenure/promotion files regarding transition to online CATS and will revisit this issue in the fall (when more CATS data are available) to determine whether to request that the Office of the Provost include this letter in all relevant tenure/promotion files.

OPIR now reports that the paper response rate figure (86%) for the fall 2016 CATS was calculated with the correct denominator (which excludes students who WX'ed the course), in which case the response rate can be directly compared to the 82% response rate for the online CATS from that semester.

Remaining questions to ask software vendor: 1) Can we identify the device type used [laptop, tablet, phone] to see how this impacts the comment rate? 2) Can individual instructors control when students get access to CATS? Is it possible to have faculty have a password to give students access, and, if so, is it desirable (since some faculty may forget)?

- (b) Academic Integrity (Andrea Welker): The subcommittee submitted a report to APC (attached) with recommendations for policy changes. The subcommittee also compiled an FAQ to assist in educating faculty (with a flow chart forthcoming). In the discussion of the academic integrity violations policy the point was made that if faculty fail to follow the procedure but impose a grade penalty anyway, the student is likely to win a grade appeal. There was some confusion over the populations reported in columns 2 and 3 of Table 1 and what conclusions could be drawn from them. In the interest of time, APC voted on just one of the recommendations in the report: APC unanimously supported the recommendation that faculty simultaneously report academic integrity violations to their college dean (or designee) and department chair. Information about this policy will be disseminated to chairs by the office of the Provost but Faculty Congress department liaisons should also inform department level faculty.
- (c) University Core Curriculum (Marylu Hill): The subcommittee submitted a report (attached) recommending that the courses that are common across the undergraduate colleges (ACS 1000, 1001; Theology 1000) together with the learning community experiences be renamed the First Year Experience (FYE). The report emphasizes the unique aspects of Villanova's FYE and spells out the connection between its academic and residential components. APC unanimously supported forwarding the report to the Office of the Provost.
- 4) Update on research policy committee proposal: The Faculty Congress Chair has invited any APC members interested in learning more about this proposal to the next Faculty Congress meeting (Friday, 4/28 from 2:30-3:30 PM in SAC 300).
- 5) Permission to record classes: Neither the current faculty handbook nor Pennsylvania law appear to require the instructor's permission to record a class. (University Council reached a similar conclusion.) APC plans to return to this topic in the fall.
- 6) Framework for cross-college majors: In order to preemptively develop a policy framework to guide the design of cross-college majors, APC discussed plans to set up a subcommittee on this topic in the fall. A list of issues (developed in part through conversation with Randy Weinstein—attached) should provide a starting point for subsequent discussions.

New Business

- 7) Diversity and inclusion questions for CATS: Craig Wheeland shared a draft of proposed new CATS questions related to diversity and inclusion with the committee. A number of questions were raised:
- (a) Has thought been given to eliminating other questions (or a more systematic reform of the CATS)? Most questions are not used in faculty evaluation and lengthy questionnaires place a substantial burden on students who fill them out for each class, each semester.
- (b) Will questions about students' learning from working and interacting with individuals from diverse backgrounds be appropriate in all classes? Some classes are relatively homogeneous in terms of student backgrounds.
- (c) For optional questions, when is the decision to include the question made by the instructor and when by the department chair?

- (d) The following question was seen as particularly problematic: “Please comment on the instructor’s sensitivity to the diversity of the students in the class. (For example, biological sex, disability, gender identity, national origin, political viewpoint, race/ethnicity, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status).”

While the committee appreciated the time and effort that went into formulating these questions, the consensus was that this is an important issue and APC will need to spend more time on it (i.e., in the fall of 2017), including meeting with members of the group that developed these questions. This will include learning the goal of the exercise and expectations for how responses would be used.

- 8) APC topics for next academic year: The committee briefly reviewed results from an earlier survey of potential topics for APC to examine next semester. Christopher will narrow the list and circulate to help develop an agenda for the coming year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 PM.

Drafted from Jennifer Dixon’s notes. Thank you!

Report to APC from the Academic Integrity Sub-committee

Members: Andrea Welker, Craig Wheeland, Eric Lomazoff, Peggy Lyons, Sherry Burrell, Brian King

Charge of Committee

The committee was formed as a sub-committee of the Academic Policy Committee (APC) to investigate how Academic Integrity Violation procedures were being implemented and to recommend improvements to the policies and procedures and to provide faculty with recommendations on how to implement the policies and procedures. The committee was formed in reaction to complaints about the policies and procedures and the anecdotal reporting that some faculty felt the process wasn't working.


Tasks of the Committee

The committee created a list of tasks to help them fulfill their charge:

- Review the current policies and procedures in detail
- Develop a set of recommendations to improve awareness (both faculty and students) of the policies and procedures
- Solicit feedback on the policies and procedures from the faculty to obtain opinions from those not involved with APC
- Using the experience of the committee members, the concerns voiced by members of the APC, and the feedback from faculty recommend changes to the policies and procedures
- Using the experience of the committee members, the concerns voiced by members of the APC, and the feedback from faculty develop a FAQ for faculty (one already exists for students)

Data Gathering



The committee analyzed data prepared by Provost's office on the history of academic integrity violations from 2013 to 2106. These data are summarized in Table 1. Key points are that 93% of students accepted responsibility. Of the 7% that appealed and went to a panel, about half were found responsible. It is also important to note that a very small number of students (about 63 per year) were officially accused of academic integrity violations. 

To gather data from the faculty a survey was created. This survey was advertised in Campus Currents and the chairs of each department were also asked to encourage their faculty to complete the form. The survey yielded 40 discrete responses, 33 of which contained valid data (Appendix A). Of the remaining seven, six were blank and the seventh (Response #29) was the self-identified "Test of survey. -EBL."

The feedback from the committee members, APC members, and general faculty (attached) were grouped into several broad categories (in no particular order):

- Concerns about the process not being implemented or completed once an accusation was filed
- Concerns that the process is too burdensome on faculty
- Feeling that the faculty must "side" with students

- Misunderstanding the philosophy of our policy (e.g. it is to be educational first)
- Need for closure from Deans about the adjudication of accusations. (Note that the policy already states that the following: "Once it has been determined that a violation has occurred (either by admission of the student or by a decision of the panel), the faculty member's dean sends a notification to all parties.")

Table 1. Summary of Academic Integrity Violations from 2013 to 2016

Class of Violation and Outcome	Current students	2016 graduates	Totals
Accusations			
Class 1	42	52	94
Class 2	50	43	93
Class 2 + Class 1	1	0	1
Class 1 + Class 1	0	0	0
Class 2 + Class 1 + Class 1	0	1 (dismissed)	1
Unknown	-	2	2
Totals	93	98	191
Outcomes			
Responsible	90	89	179
Not responsible	3	7	10
Unknown	-	2	2

Outcomes

The committee has addressed many of these concerns with the following actions:

- Revised the Policy, Code, and Detailed Procedures (Appendix B), key changes are:
 - Refinement of Section B of the Academic Integrity Policy to reflect fact that "F for the assignment" is the typical penalty imposed (but instructor has discretion here)
 - Modified procedure for the submission of Academic Integrity Violations: the accusation will now be simultaneously be sent to the Chair and Dean (or designee)
 - Addition of definition for "preponderance of the evidence" to the Detailed Procedures for appeals
 - Revision of nomination process to serve on Board of Academic Integrity found in the Detailed Procedures
 - Added statement to the detailed procedures that a chairperson should recuse him/herself from hearing the student's appeal of the grade penalty if the chairperson attended the appeal hearing
- Developed a DRAFT FAQ for faculty (Appendix C). This will require more work.
- Communicate the importance of academic integrity with links to the Policies, etc. to students (Newswire) and faculty (Campus Currents) at the beginning of each semester. The faculty are reminded that if they impose a grade penalty, they must report the violation.
 - Notice to students: Academic integrity is a primary value for any institution of higher education. Cheating on tests, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty and misconduct are completely unacceptable, especially at Villanova which prides itself on its commitment to the Augustinian values of truth, unity, and love. For more

information about Villanova's policy, code and procedures, use the link to more info.

<http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/resources/student/policies/integrity.html>

- Notice to faculty: Academic integrity is crucial for achieving the University's mission, and therefore requires persistent protection by its members. As the new semester begins, faculty are reminded that if they impose a grade penalty for an academic integrity violation, they are also obligated to refer the student to their dean for a Class I or Class II academic integrity violation. For more on this obligation, see information on the Academic Integrity webpage see the link to more info.

<http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/resources/student/policies/integrity.html>

Appendix A: Faculty Feedback

Responses to the Academic Integrity Violation Procedures Survey
Academic Integrity Subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee

(Raw data received, and responses isolated, on March 13, 2017)

Response #1

"I have not gotten deep into the process. I recently found that a student-athlete had lied about being at an away game and needing to reschedule his exam (emailed me a few hours before the exam), but then we saw each other on campus a couple hours later (which was right before the scheduled exam). He followed up with an email saying he mistakenly thought he'd be away and then he came to the exam. I brought this instance of academic dishonesty to my chair who simply referred me to the document that describes my options. Without his support, however, I felt that the process would be too burdensome and that it wouldn't be worth it (additionally, the student is very likely to fail the class anyway). I wish the process were easier for faculty; I would like to submit a written report and then have some other individual follow up. With all the other responsibilities I have, it's just too much to make the faculty member responsible for all aspects of pursuing a claim against a student."

Response #2

"A few years back, a student submitted a paper to me with a number of properly footnoted passages. However, the paper also had sections and / or information clearly taken from a source *without* attribution. I notified the student that I would file with the AIB. At the hearing, the student *admitted* that he did not put in footnotes. His reasoning? "I thought the paper had too many footnotes already." He *admitted* that he was ignorant of proper footnoting procedure and, when asked by the board, he *admitted* that ignorance was not an excuse. Nevertheless, the board found in the student's favor. Since that time, I have never filed an AIB motion"

Response #3

"Overall, I have found it easy to follow. I often use the option of "second level" violations, which helps impress students that they violated the policy without my feeling guilty I have ruined their record, but it also allows me to feel good in case the student is a chronic cheater then the admin can deal with it."

Response #4

[Blank]

Response #5

"I think the academic integrity process works very well. The major issue is ensuring faculty are aware of the policy and upholding it. Because these issues don't come around very often, I think we forget the details."

Response #6

"1. In my experience, faculty are pressured not to fail students. Thus, while the official policy leaves the penalty in the hand of the instructor, current practice undermines faculty authority.

2. Asking students to take an online course about academic integrity is basically lip service to the issue. Villanova needs to do a much better job of teaching academic values and specific practices of citation. Too many students

do not grasp the corrosive quality of cheating. I expect the university to convey the damage cheating does not merely to an individual but to the very idea of the shared pursuit of knowledge.

3. I would like the option to force a seriously or egregiously cheating student to drop my course immediately. The very idea that a cheater should continue in the course is offensive, and the idea that a cheater should participate in student course evaluations is preposterous."

Response #7

"ALL of the academic integrity violations that I have had during my 10+ years at Villanova have all been handled internally, here at the College. None have been reported to the University. For example, when a paper or project has evidence of plagiarism or is from a previous year or student it is brought to the attention of the UG dean who then negotiates with faculty and student - typically, the student re-writes and a different faculty is asked to grade that submission. Paper or project violations "never leave the building" as per admin request.

In regards to cheating on exams, again it stays internal. Over the past 2 years I have had the experience of checking (walking into room) on a student who is in a private room because of testing accommodations and have found them quickly shoving their cell phone under a sweatshirt or into a pocket. My reaction is to ask them for the phone which I then take out to the secretaries office and place with their backpacks. With the cell phone incident I was asked by my associate dean why I had not checked the student for a phone prior to the exam - basically I should body search them. If I "allowed" them to have the phone then, and I quote, "what can you expect? It is not the students fault because the exam is difficult and the temptation great.". Now I basically act as a police officer in testing situations and when I find phones or calculators that store memory I just take the device and don't bother reporting or sharing with other faculty.

At this College faculty are basically punished for "bad" student behavior and this includes integrity violations.

Because there is no support of faculty who report here at this College I know that there must be no support of faculty who report to upper admin levels. Also, the fallout from going outside of this college is not worth the risk."

Response #8

"I have dealt with submission before and it has not been a problem, but I overheard a colleague say "I veto submitting this AI because it will go up the chain and it is a real pain." The consequence of that is students think they can get away with things. I think the policy should be changed that minor infractions are dealt with by the faculty member and that if the student wants to appeal the minor penalty then they can move through the AI procedure. I say this because I have had issues where a small assignment (3% of total grade) had plagiarism issues that were real, but also a pain to go forward on. The student accepted that they had violated the policy and I gave them a zero on the assignment without reporting it. I think this happens a lot and the more onerous and top bottom approach that is made this will prevent people from reporting and actually turning a blind eye to the situation."

Response #9

"My opinion is that we need to have an honor code that is adjudicated by students and monitored by faculty. Student policing is the only way to ensure better integrity.

The process is too arduous for faculty to bother with. I have been through it at least 10 times (with a couple that went to hearings) and it takes a bit of effort from the faculty member. And at the end, penalties are too lenient."

Response #10

"The difference between a Class 1 and Class 2 violation are confusing and seem artificial. Cheating is cheating and that includes self plagiarism. The cases where I have been involved as an administrator are clearly evident based on Safe Assign. After the student is confronted with information supporting the violation, they must sign a document that does not give an opportunity to prove that they are being unjustly accused. They are forced to admit that they violated the policy and then appeal.

We also need to be concerned with identity verification with on-line courses. There needs to be a system where students are required to use facial recognition software to log into the exam. The student must use a web-cam periodically during the virtual class and this image is captured for comparison."

Response #11

"1. In general, the process works well, although there is quite a burden on a faculty member who wishes to file a complaint.

2. Prior to the appeal hearing the student should be required to file a document outlining their basis for appeal. Right now the appeal board members may only see the original complaint, and more information prior to the hearing would be great.

3. The penalty of just a zero on the assignment in question is not severe enough. At the faculty members discretion something like a "one grade level reduction" should be optional."

Response #12

"I have never submitted a violation. Not because I have not identified them but because it has been shared that the process is exceptionally tedious for faculty and that the process is unfairly weighted in favor of students.

I have, however, been asked to participate in a hearing. The accused student decided, on the day of the hearing, as it was beginning to plead guilty. It was an egregious waste of time---convening a meeting and requiring participants to prepare in order to plead out. It is my belief that this behavior reflected the seriousness with which the student viewed the process.

I would be more inclined to submit violations if there were different levels of doing so. For instance, if I could have it noted that a student had been accused of plagiarism, but handled within the confines of a course, I would do so. This would allow me the comfort of knowing that it has gone on record without the complexity of knowing that a first offense could be 1) exhausting for me and 2) overly problematic for a student who may have learned their lesson."

Response #13

"Overall, I think the process itself works well. I have been through it in a few different roles and I see how it works. My associate dean and staff have been supportive (at the undergraduate level) and handled things in a timely manner.

I am not sure all faculty and students understand the process, though. The challenges I see are mostly focused on the question on "When should I, as a faculty member, write up a violation?" There is a perception (which many including myself share), that small violations worth 1% or so of a course grade shouldn't be subjected to the same process as violations on major exams and the like. I think there is also a lot of misunderstanding about how much of a "warning" is built into the system. Put these two ideas together and you often have faculty thinking that the best way to handle these "small first-time offenses" is to handle it within one's class and not part of the larger university system. "

Response #14

"In my experience, the process of reporting is not taken very seriously by various relevant parties on campus. For example, I had a student who repeatedly attempted to cheat on exams in one of my classes this past fall. I reported the suspicious behavior to representatives in the Office for Undergraduate Students, but there was little follow up. This was despite the representative noting that similar behavior was seemingly being observed by other professors who had the same student in their classes. In fact, the office for undergraduate students reached out to me about the student initially regarding the student's behavior. I assumed the office was proactively attempting to determine what was going on with the student. However, there was no follow up and I felt there was little interest in pursuing the case. As a result, I simply gave the student an F on the final exam rather than pursuing a larger, university investigation given I did not have concrete evidence of cheating (e.g., a "cheat sheet") and did not know that there would be much accomplished by filing a formal grievance. "

Response #15

"I have participated in several academic integrity review panels and them to be conducted respectfully and fairly.

I would prefer to have the option to handle this locally and less formally with input from the department chair / program director as follows: when plagiarism on a paper is confirmed, after review of what plagiarism is with the student, the student has the opportunity to rewrite the assignment for a maximum grade of B."

Response #16

"I once had a student a few years ago that "Safe Assign" showed that 89% of the paper had been plagiarized, but when brought to the attention of administration the student was given another chance to rewrite the paper.

Thank you!"

Response #17

"I am sorry if you feel this is a negative comment on the process, but here is my feeling on this topic.

"One can teach all the ethics one wants to teach, but the way to graduate people who will act ethically in the world outside is to have them "live" ethics in the college environment. So, to me, our Academic Integrity approach should be an honor code. An honor code where one is expelled for violating the code and/or for witnessing a violation and not reporting it."

This would apply to any cheating, which is quite widespread at Villanova. Implementation issues: (1) this code would need to be communicated to all potential applicants so they knew ahead of time what the expectations are. (2) I would have a more subjective approach for plagiarism because this can be ambiguous at times and truly unintentional in some cases."

Response #18

"My experiences with the academic integrity process have unfortunately been rather depressing over the years. I've reported a number of cases of clear and extensive plagiarism, as the rules require us to do. In cases in which the student does not argue the penalty, things proceed without trouble. However, in every single case in which the student has objected, I have received no support or backup from academic leadership, from the level of department chair through associate provost, and in several cases I've been pressured to reduce the penalty to make the problem go away. (In none of these cases has anyone argued that the finding of plagiarism was incorrect or the penalty was outside the university's requirements.)

In one particularly egregious case before I had tenure, I was required by my chair, associate dean, and associate VPAA (at the time) to meet with the angry parent of a student who had copied his final paper from Wikipedia. There was no doubt about the student's guilt, but the parent was very angry. He identified himself as a wealthy donor, demanded that I withdraw the grade penalty, and (I was later told) demanded that I be fired. I was made to sit at a table with him while he angrily berated me. He was allowed, from the first moment of the meeting, to treat me with open and utter contempt, and neither of my colleagues - chair and associate dean - raised any objection or spoke in support of my action or the university rules. The associate dean later told me that if I hadn't handled the parent well, it "would have been appropriate for you not to get tenure." The grade penalty stood, and the student had to retake the course from another instructor, but a great deal of damage was done to my faith in the institution and its leadership.

This damage was reinforced by later cases in which students who had violated the academic integrity code demanded that they not be penalized - despite, in every case, not denying the clearly documented and extensive evidence. It has become clear that in such cases, my department and college leadership will not support the faculty member and will, if the situation is unpleasant enough, "encourage" the faculty member to reduce a standard penalty (such as an F on the paper) to satisfy the student. I came to this realization unfortunately late; some of my colleagues both inside and outside the department have said this for years and several have explicitly told me that they do not report academic integrity violations because they expect student blowback and no leadership support when it happens.

(By the way - in all of these cases, I've never been involved with an AIV panel; student complaints seem to go directly through chair and dean. I've heard about AIV panels operating in other cases, but I wonder how consistent the procedures are.)

Faculty cannot shoulder the entire burden of trying to enforce university policies when leadership won't support them. I've tried to adapt to this situation by changing assignments to make them difficult to plagiarize, but

unfortunately this means having students do less research and writing, and we can only go so far in that direction. If Villanova wants to provide a rigorous education consistent with our stated institutional values, and particularly if we want to function as a research university, academic integrity procedures need to function much more reliably than they currently do."

Response #19

"The existing system is too lenient. Many other universities would dismiss students for the equivalent of a Class I violation. There should be a severity clause that allows a student to be dismissed if the violation were severe enough."

Response #20

"My previous encounters with the system have been uniformly negative, so I have stopped looking for academic misconduct.

In the past, I have found cases of academic misconduct (plagiarism), which both my chair and the chair of the department undergraduate committee agreed were clear cases of misconduct. Having met that strict criterion, I submitted reports. The first time, I submitted the report and never again heard back about the outcome. The second instance, I reported 6 cases of plagiarism, and although the students were disciplined, the informal feedback I got was that the higher ups thought that 6 cases in a class of 40 were too many, so probably the instructor was at fault (12% is below the level of cheating reported by students in anonymous surveys). One of such students went on to plagiarizing again in the same course; I submitted a second report of academic misconduct; once again I heard nothing about the outcome (the student graduated that same year).

My sense is that most faculty in my department look the other way, reporting only the most egregious cases (the ones they can't turn a blind eye to). To report cases of academic misconduct is a 'lots of pain, no gain' activity, and new faculty are quickly socialized to turn a blind eye to it.

So my first piece of feedback would be: communicate to faculty that you are not just paying lip service to this issue. Doing so would require more than just saying so. For example, you would be well served by publicizing stats regarding % of reports of academic misconduct and whether they are in line with what is to be expected given the evidence of academic misconduct reported in the literature (my guess is that they are woefully under-reported); you may even establish institutional structures that reward the report of such cases (admittedly, this is tricky to implement). All of this is heavy lifting, so I would not hold it against you if you decide that you'd rather put your energy on some other goal with better returns. :-)"

Response #21

"I feel our academic integrity policy is pretty much useless. Cheating is very widespread and no one ever get dismissed from the university. For years I have suggested a true honor code be adopted. That said, I believe plagiarism should be treated somewhat differently as they can sometimes be a grey area. However, once a few students were dismissed for cheating on exams or papers, and one or two were dismissed for not reporting cheating when they saw it, I feel we would get rid of the widespread cheating on campus. I believe you can teach all the ethics you want, but if you don't live it, it doesn't really help bring about ethical behavior."

Response #22

"Good Afternoon,

Below is the copy from a letter that was sent to various levels of Administration after I had an incident of plagiarism in my class last semester. I would be happy to be involve in any committee addressing this issue. Thank you.

[XXX NAME REDACTED -- HAD BEEN PROVIDED BY RESPONDENT XXX]

Over the last few days I have given the process much thought and would like to share some reflections with you.

Having two Class levels of violations allows for a serious, ?student must go,? level and a level that would address less serious problems and one that the student will acknowledge and learn from in his/her effort to be a better student and hopefully, a better individual. It is growth level that I would like to address.

When the student issue is recognized and brought to your attention, most faculty members would have already addressed the student with the issue. Moving the incident to the administrative level already indicates the seriousness of the issue. The process, as I understand it, currently is as follows:

1. The student is contacted by the Dean and asked to admit guilt of the breach of the academic integrity code to the faculty member and the Dean.
2. The student responds to the request and admits guilt to the breach of the academic integrity code.

The student who accepts responsibility for an integrity violation must visit the Academic Integrity Gateway in order to reread Villanova?s Academic Integrity Code.

The student is required to write a formal letter of apology to the faculty instructor of the course in which the violation occurred.

The student must write a formal letter to the Graduate Dean that reflects on their experience.

Since the goal would be to address the problem while maintaining the dignity of the person, having to admit your guilt four different times (Professor, Dean, Professor, Dean) appears to me at least to be more punitive, than developmental and merciful. I know that many university policies are developed by faculty and administration working in committees. I would ask that if you feel that my reflections have merit that the policy is revisited, and possibly be revised to be more balanced with justice and mercy.

Pope Francis writes, ?It is mercy which changes the heart and the life, which can regenerate a person and allow him or her to integrate into society in a new way.? Thank you for any consideration that you give my thoughts."

Response #23

"The most unfortunate aspect of the policy is the PERCEPTION of the burden it places on the faculty to report an AIV. I have heard several colleagues say "it is too much trouble to file a AIV against a student." I am not sure what can be done about this, but if this perception does exist among some faculty it is likely AIVs as not being reported as often as they should. Perhaps we need to come up with levels of violations, where a determination of "lower level" violations are easier to report, and adjudicate than more severe violations. Yes, I do realize this is a slippery slope, but if there is a "its not worth it"

attitude among faculty, that is a HUGE problem. (I have both filed AIVs and sat on the appeals boards for AIVs.)"

Response #24

"In May 2016 I sent three academic integrity reports to the chair of the department according to University policy. I never heard anything further about the cases. I think that the chair did not send the reports to the dean as required by University policy, but it could be that the dean did receive the reports and did not contact me and the students, as specified in the University policy. The chair has not responded to my inquiries about this, and I hesitate going to the dean directly.

Not following the University policy is unfair to the students because they then do not have a chance to defend themselves. Also, the lack of followup in these cases makes me reluctant to ever file a report through the system again, since the current policy and procedures do not seem to be taken seriously and followed by my chair and/or dean."

Response #25

[Blank]

Response #26

"Unfortunately, student cheating on examinations is rampant in the business school. While we have our share of plagiarism, it is cheating on exams that causes the greatest distortion in grades. The nearly complete failure of the academic integrity in the University to support faculty who identified this cheating and to punish students who engage in it provides support for students who choose to cheat.

The idea that students are given the benefit the doubt when they are watched cheating by their professor is a major problem spot. Unless the professor has tangible evidence that cheating has occurred, such as cheat sheets, the academic integrity board will not support the professor's punishment of the students involved.

The fact that the academic integrity policy assumes that the student has not cheated unless there is concrete evidence to the contrary inhibits professors from trying to eliminate cheating in their classrooms."

Response #27

"I have served on several review panels for academic integrity cases. I believe the system has worked well.

I do think there needs to be a level of discretion between the faculty member and the student at which point an assignment can simply be rejected for resubmission for a maximum grade of B or some such thing, with no reporting beyond the faculty - student level. In my decades of academic life prior to the existence of this policy, I have found students to be grateful for that solution."

Response #28

[Blank]

Response #29

"Test of survey. -EBL"

Response #30

"I have two pieces of feedback about the university's academic integrity policies and practices.

First, a few years ago, I had a senior who was taking an introductory class with me. The student submitted a paper that was substantially plagiarized. I submitted an academic integrity violation report indicating that it was a Class I violation and he received a 0 for the paper assignment. I subsequently learned from the student's advisor that this was not the first academic integrity violation that the student had had. Despite this fact, the student was not kicked out of the university, possibly because he was a member of a varsity sports team.

Second, I find it troubling that the university destroys its records of academic integrity violations after a student has graduated, and further instructs faculty that it is against university policy and students' rights for us to acknowledge to possible employers or others outside the university that a former student has violated the university's academic integrity code. This policy, which treats students as consumers, should be eliminated. If a student violates the academic integrity code, and especially if a student does more than once, that student should be responsible for his/her actions."

Response #31

"This is a difficult area. What we need to explore is the student culture, and how to have them buy into the process. Having more oversight for the faculty is in some ways taking the responsibility away from the students. They need to see this as something they value and are proud of it. We have to be careful not to disrespect the great majority of honest students, and this is not an easy task. We have to show trust to have it earned. I recommend that we study or bring in people from systems with student run honor systems. It is disappointing that VU is not listed as one with a notable academic honor system.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic_honor_code"

Response #32

[Blank]

Response #33

"The Academic Integrity Violation (AIV) procedures at Villanova University are essentially a farce. As a faculty member, I have gone through the process accusing two students of cheating. The violations were flagrant and the attitude of the students in question was belligerent but much of the evidence was not allowed to be introduced. In spite of this, I felt the evidence I provided was more than enough to meet the university's standard of proof which is that a "preponderance of evidence" is sufficient for conviction. I do not believe this standard was applied. Moreover, during the deliberations, I felt I was the one being accused of doing something wrong and ultimately felt humiliated by the process and the outcome. This was my first time going through the process and it will be my last time."

Response #34

"Unable to comment on any aspect of the AIV process because ALL violations have been handled here at the college, none have been reported outside of this building. "

Response #35

"I believe we are too lenient in cases of premeditated cheating. I think for clear cut cases of premeditated cheating on final exams a minimum penalty should be 1 semester suspension and the student should not be able to retake the course with the same professor. That may mean that if it is a required course and only taught by one professor that the student needs to find another university to take that course.

I think college policies and proctor support (when necessary) for in class, take home and distance exams would be helpful.

Overall I think we have a population of students that do not cheat, but I know there are some out there. "

Response #36

"The process when an instructor discovers an infringement is not quite clear. One the one hand, there's the sense that the instructor may impose a penalty--fail the specific assignment, fail the course, or a some kind of a mix of the two; on the other hand, the violation code stipulates that the instructor must report the infraction to the chair, who must take it up with the Dean, and though there's Class I and Class II infringements that the instructor might determine, it's unclear if the Instructor can handle a violation entirely on their own, at least, as spelled out on their syllabus.

Could we get clarity on the difference between Class I and II?

Is there a space for an Instructor to handle a violation, or for the process to end within the department?

Should there be a uniform punishment, so we don't have a situation where one professor punishes a Class I violation with, say, the student's loss of 50% of the points in the assignment, and another punishes same with an F?"

Response #37

"The aspect of the AIV process that does not work is inconsistent enforcement. Some students are punished more than others for the same violations--for the same assignment for the same class.

Others who have committed two Class I violations (supposedly grounds for dismissal from the university) are allowed to continue without consequence."

Response #38

[Blank]

Response #39

[Blank]

Response #40

"honestly, I've lost some faith in the process. really went back and forth about turning a student in - this was 4 (5?) yrs ago - because I knew the student in question already had a mark on their record. Turned the student in - my chair

told me I had no choice. The student admitted what they had done and was crying (because they knew expulsion was coming?) A few months later - new semester - I found out that the student was enrolled. I get it - admins make the final call here (as my chair told me). just wish I understood why we don't expel the repeat offenders. just drop the policy if we're not going to enforce it !!!"

Appendix B: Revised Code, Policy, and Procedures

- Changes are indicated in yellow and strikethrough.

Revision: April 2017

Villanova's Code of Academic Integrity

Statement of Purpose

Academic integrity is vital to any university community for many reasons. Students receive credit for doing assignments because they are supposed to learn from those assignments, and the vast majority do so honestly. Anyone who hands in work that is not his or her own, or who cheats on a test, or plagiarizes a paper, is not learning, is receiving credit dishonestly and is, in effect, stealing from other students. As a consequence, it is crucial that students do their own work. Students who use someone else's work or ideas without saying so, or who otherwise perform dishonestly in a course, are cheating. In effect, they are lying. Such dishonesty, moreover, threatens the integrity not only of the individual student, but also of the university community as a whole.

Academic integrity lies at the heart of the values expressed in the University's Mission Statement and inspired by the spirit of Saint Augustine. When one comes to Villanova, one joins an academic community founded on the search for knowledge in an atmosphere of cooperation and trust. The intellectual health of the community depends on this trust and draws nourishment from the integrity and mutual respect of each of its members.

Code of Academic Integrity

The following are some rules and examples regarding academic dishonesty. Since academic dishonesty takes place whenever anyone undermines the academic integrity of the institution or attempts to gain an unfair advantage over others, this list is not and cannot be exhaustive. Academic integrity is not simply a matter of conforming to certain rules; it must be understood in terms of the broader academic purposes of a Villanova education.

A. Cheating:

While taking a test or examination, students shall rely on their own mastery of the subject and not attempt to receive help in any way not explicitly approved by the instructor; for example, students shall not try to use notes, study aids, or another's work.

Such cheating includes trying to give or obtain information about a test when the instructor states that it is to be confidential. It also includes trying to take someone else's exam, or trying to have someone else take one's own exam.

B. Fabrication:

Students shall not falsify, invent, or use in a deliberately misleading way any information, data, or citations in any assignment.

This includes making up or changing data or results, or relying on someone else's results, in an experiment or lab assignment. It also includes citing sources that one has not actually used or consulted.

C. Assisting in or contributing to academic dishonesty:

Students shall not help or attempt to help others to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

This includes situations in which one student copies from or uses another student's work; in such situations, both students are likely to be penalized equally severely. (If the assisting student is not enrolled in the particular course, the Hearing Panel will formulate a suitable and equivalent penalty.)

Students are responsible for ensuring that their work is not used improperly by others. This does not include team projects where students are told by their instructor to work together.

D. Plagiarism:

Students shall not rely on or use someone else's words, ideas, data, or arguments without clearly acknowledging the source and extent of the reliance or use.

The most common way to acknowledge this reliance or indebtedness is to use footnotes or other documentation. It is the students' responsibility to show clearly when and where they are relying on others - partly because others may wish to learn from the same sources from which the original writer learned. Since this indebtedness may be of many kinds, some definitions and examples of plagiarism are listed below.

- ❑ Using someone else's words without acknowledgment. If you use someone else's words, not only must you give the source, but you must also put them within quotation marks or use some other appropriate means of indicating that the words are not your own. This includes spoken words and written words, and mathematical equations, whether or not they have been formally published.
- ❑ Using someone else's ideas, data, or argument without acknowledgment, even if the words are your own. If you use someone else's examples, train of thought, or experimental results, you must acknowledge that use. Paraphrasing, summarizing, or rearranging someone else's words, ideas, or results does not alter your indebtedness.
- ❑ Acknowledging someone else in a way that will lead a reader to think your indebtedness is less than it actually was. For example, if you take a whole paragraph worth of ideas from a source,

and include as your final sentence a quotation from that source, you must indicate that your indebtedness includes more than just the quotation. If you simply put a page number after the quotation, you will lead the reader to think that only the quotation comes from the source. Instead, make clear that you have used more than the quotation.

The examples above constitute plagiarism regardless of who or what the source is. The words or ideas of a roommate or of an encyclopedia, or notes from another class, require acknowledgment just as much as the words or ideas of a scholarly book do. Introductions and notes to books also require acknowledgment.

The examples above constitute plagiarism even in cases where the student uses material accidentally or unintentionally. So, for example, a paper can be plagiarized even if you have forgotten that you used a certain source, or even if you have included material accidentally without remembering that it was taken from some other source. One of the most common problems is that students write a draft of a paper without proper documentation, intending to go back later to "put in the references." In some cases, students accidentally hand such papers in instead of the footnoted version, or they forget to put in some of the footnotes in their final draft. So the fact that the wrong draft was submitted is not a defense against an accusation of plagiarism. In general, students are held accountable for the work that they actually hand in, rather than the work that they intended to hand in. Furthermore, students are responsible for proper documentation of drafts of papers, if those drafts are submitted to the professor. In general, students are responsible for taking careful notes on sources, and for keeping track of their sources throughout the various stages of the writing process. Notes must clearly identify the information you have obtained and where you acquired it, so that later you can acknowledge your indebtedness accurately. Do not look at a source without having something handy with which to take such notes.

You need not provide footnotes for items that are considered common knowledge. What constitutes common knowledge, however, varies from academic field to academic field, so you should consult with your instructor. In general, the harder it would be for someone to find the fact you have mentioned, the more you need to footnote it.

E. Multiple submissions of work:

Students shall not submit academic work for a class which has been done for another class without the prior approval of the instructor.

In any assignment, an instructor is justified in expecting that a certain kind of learning will be taking place. Handing in something done previously may preclude this learning. Consequently, if a student hands in work done elsewhere without receiving his or her instructor's approval, he or she will face penalties.

F. Unsanctioned collaboration:

When doing out-of-class projects, homework, or assignments, students must work

individually unless collaboration has been expressly permitted by the instructor. Students who do collaborate without express permission of their instructor must inform the instructor of the nature of their collaboration. If the collaboration is unacceptable, the instructor will determine the appropriate consequences (which may include treating the situation as an academic integrity violation.)

Many Villanova courses involve team projects and out of class collaboration, but in other situations, out of class collaboration is forbidden. Students should assume that they are expected to do their work independently unless cooperation is specifically authorized by the teacher.

G. Other forms of dishonesty:

Acting honestly in an academic setting includes more than just being honest in one's academic assignments; students are expected to be honest in all dealings with the University. Certain kinds of dishonesty, though often associated with academic work, are of a different category than those listed above. These kinds of dishonesty include (but are not limited to) the following:

- ❑ Misrepresenting oneself or one's circumstances to an instructor (for example, in requesting a makeup exam or a special due date for an assignment, or in explaining an absence).
- ❑ Forging parts of, or signatures on, official documents (including both university documents, such as drop-add slips or excused absence slips, and relevant outside documents, such as doctors' notes).
- ❑ Taking credit for work in a team-project even when the student has made little or no contribution to the work of the team.
- ❑ Stealing or damaging library books.
- ❑ Unlawfully copying computer software.

These serious offenses will be handled by the University's disciplinary procedures.

H. Penalties and Appeals:

Students who receive an academic integrity penalty may, if they believe that they have not committed an academic integrity violation, take their case to the Board of Academic Integrity.

Individual Course Penalty. The academic penalty will be determined by the student's instructor. Typically, a student who violates the academic integrity code in a course will receive an F for the assignment ~~course~~, or, at the discretion of the instructor, a more less-severe penalty, including an F in the course (in the School of Business, all faculty members assign a grade of

Commented [CW1]: I moved this sentence from the section on University Penalty so it is consistent with Faculty Handbook changes

zero to any work in violation of the Code). Students who feel that the penalty is too harsh may appeal their grade through the normal University procedure for resolving grade disputes.

If the penalty for the violation is an F for the course, the student will not be permitted to withdraw from the course. If, after the penalty grade has been taken into account, the student is still passing the course, the student may withdraw from the course prior to the final deadline for withdrawing from a course.

University Penalty. Students who violate the code of Academic Integrity are also referred to their Dean for a University penalty. Two kinds of penalty are available – Class I and Class II. A full academic integrity violation is a Class I violation and Class II violations are usually appropriate for less serious cases, or in cases where there are mitigating circumstances. Typically, a student with two Class I violations will be **dismissed** expelled from university school. In some cases, the Dean (**or designee**) may choose to treat a violation of the Academic Integrity Code as a Class II violation. Typically, a student may receive only one Class II violation during his or her four year career as an undergraduate. All subsequent violations are treated as Class I violations.

Students who have committed an academic integrity violation will be expected to complete an educational program, supervised by the student's college Dean (**or designee**), to help the student come to a fuller understanding of academic integrity. Students who fail to complete the educational program to the satisfaction of the Dean (**or designee**), and within the timelines specified by the Dean (**or designee**), will have a hold placed on their transcript until the program has been completed.

Detailed descriptions of the University's Academic Integrity Policy are available from department chairs and deans.

Commented [CW2]: We rearranged some sentences in this paragraph without changing the text.

Commented [CW3]: The word dismissed is in the Faculty Handbook, so let's use dismissed

Commented [CW4]: I don't think we need this sentence anymore, because everything is online

Academic Integrity Policy

A. Jurisdiction

This policy covers all cases where graduate or undergraduate students are alleged to have committed academic dishonesty at Villanova University in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Nursing, Professional Studies or School of Business. This policy does not apply to students solely in the School of Law, which has its own policy.

B. Procedure

If a faculty member believes that a student has committed an academic integrity violation, the faculty member shall, under normal circumstances, notify the student, allowing the student an opportunity to respond. Faculty members who have questions about whether an incident constitutes an academic integrity violation are urged to consult with their chair, dean, or with the chair of the Academic Integrity Board. If the faculty member continues to believe that a violation has occurred, the faculty member assigns an appropriate grade, typically an F for the assignment-course, or, at the discretion of the instructor, a more less-severe penalty, including an F in the course-the course, an F for the assignment, or some other grade that the faculty member judges appropriate (in the School of Business, all faculty members assign a grade of zero to any work in violation of the Code). At the sole discretion of the faculty member, the faculty member may also offer the student an opportunity to redo the work or complete an alternate or additional piece of work. If the faculty member assigns a grade penalty, the faculty member must report in writing to his or her dean (or designee) and chair or program director that an academic integrity violation has occurred. A form is available for reporting violations or faculty members may write a letter. The letter ~~faculty member~~ should give a brief account of the matter and, where appropriate, should include copies of the assignment and other documentary evidence. The faculty member must ~~may~~ also make a recommendation to the dean (or designee) as to whether the violation should be treated as a Class I violation or as a Class II violation. Typically, violations of the Academic Integrity Code are treated as Class I violations, but in cases which are less serious or where there are mitigating circumstances, the violation may be treated as a Class II violation.

~~In cases that are particularly complex, the faculty member may also recommend that the matter be referred to the Board of Academic Integrity. If the department chair-dean (designee) has questions, the chair-dean (or designee) may refer the matter back to the faculty member or ask for further clarification from the faculty member. Unless the faculty member wishes to withdraw the case, the dean (or designee) chair-sends a copy of the faculty member's report to the faculty member's dean.~~

When the faculty member's dean (or designee) receives the report, the dean (or designee) reviews the case. If the dean (or designee) has questions about the case, the dean (or designee) may request further consultation with the student, the faculty member, or the chair. Unless the faculty member wishes to withdraw the case at this point, the faculty member's dean (or designee) makes a determination of the level of the violation (whether Class I or Class II), giving serious weight to the recommendation of the faculty member and chair. If a student has previously received a violation, (either Class I or Class II), then all subsequent violations will normally be held to be Class I violations.

The faculty member's dean (or designee) sends a hard copy or e-mail letter (using the official University e-mail system) to the student informing the student that the student is being charged with having committed an academic integrity violation, and indicating the level of the violation. The letter to the student should include a copy of the academic integrity policy. Copies should also be sent to all parties (defined as follows): the faculty member; the student; the student's dean (if different); the faculty member's chair; the faculty member's program director (if different); and the chair of the board of academic integrity. The student shall respond in writing to the faculty member's dean (or designee) within five business days of receipt of the notice of complaint (excluding public and University holidays), either admitting the violation or asserting innocence. Failure to respond will be construed as admission that a violation has occurred. The faculty member's dean (or designee) will send copies of the student's letter to all of the parties indicated above. If the student admits that a violation has occurred but asserts that there are extenuating circumstances, the student should explain this in the letter to the dean (or designee). The dean (or designee) may, at any point in the proceedings, change the level of the violation from Class I to Class II.

If the student denies that an academic integrity offense has occurred, the dean (or designee) will refer the matter to the Chair of the Board of Academic Integrity, with notification of this to the other parties.

Upon receiving notice from the dean (or designee), the chair of the Board of Academic Integrity will assemble a panel consisting of three faculty and two student members of the Board of Academic Integrity. The panel will make a determination (based on a preponderance of the evidence) of whether academic dishonesty has occurred and will convey its finding to the dean (or designee), who will advise the student and faculty member of their rights of appeal. If several students are involved in one case, the dean (or designee) may request that the panel consider the situation of all involved students, even if one or more do not deny having committed an academic integrity offense. If the panel finds that no violation has occurred, the faculty member's dean (or designee) will advise the faculty member to re-grade the assignment in question (on the premise that no violation has occurred), and notification will be sent to all parties. The Chair of the Board of Academic Integrity may make informal recommendations to the dean (or designee) on issues relating to the level of the violation, but the purpose of the panel is to consider whether an academic integrity violation has occurred. The panel does not make recommendations on issues such as mitigating circumstances or the severity of the punishment.

If the panel determines that a violation has occurred, the original grade assigned by the faculty member will stand. If a student believes that the grade assigned is inappropriate, the student may appeal the grade through the normal procedure for handling complaints concerning grades. ~~As usual~~ in such cases, the instructor's stated policy regarding grading and academic integrity will be taken into account and given great weight. The complaint process will only consider the grade, and will not review the panel's decision that an academic integrity violation has occurred.

Once it has been determined that a violation has occurred (either by admission of the student, or by a decision of the panel) the faculty member's dean (or designee) sends a notification to all parties. At this point, the case is turned over to the student's dean (or designee). The student's dean (or designee) will supervise a program of education and reflection on the meaning and importance of academic integrity. This may include any or all of the following: written exercises; participation in an academic integrity educational program supervised by the college; or community service. If this program is not carried out within the timelines specified by the dean and to the dean's satisfaction, the dean will impose a judicial hold on the student's records (and inform the student that such a hold has been placed). This will prevent the student from registering for courses or graduating until the conditions imposed by the dean have been satisfied. The student's dean (or designee) may also impose or recommend additional disciplinary penalties.

A student who has two Class I violations of the academic integrity code will be reviewed by his or her dean (or designee). The dean (or designee) will review the student's file and also consult with other academic deans if one or more of the cases occurred in another college. Absent extenuating or mitigating circumstances, the student will be dismissed from the University and a record of the reason for the dismissal will be retained in the student's permanent file and will appear on the student's official transcript. At the sole discretion of the dean (or designee), the student may be suspended or put on probation instead of dismissed, with or without a permanent indication on the transcript.

Materials on academic integrity violations will be retained in the files until the student graduates or otherwise severs all relationship with the University. If there is no indication of an academic integrity violation on the student's transcript, the files will be removed and destroyed. If there is an indication on the student's transcript, the files will be retained.

Students who believe that an integrity violation has occurred should report the suspected violation to the faculty member. If the faculty member does not act on the report, the student may also report the matter, in writing, directly to the faculty member's chair or dean (or designee), who will then make a judgment as to whether an academic integrity violation has occurred, and, if so, will follow the process described above.

DETAILED PROCEDURES

December, 1998 (updated July 2, 2002; July 2016; March 2017)

A. Official Members of the Process

1. The Board of Academic Integrity consists of faculty members and students. From its ranks come the members of a Hearing Panel for any case of alleged academic dishonesty. The Provost will appoint the following members to serve ~~three-year terms~~ on the Board

- a) A Chair of the Board who shall be appointed by the Provost and will oversee all procedures of this policy.
- b) At least five full-time faculty members with at least one from each of the four colleges nominated by the **department chairs (program directors in Nursing)** deans of those colleges. At least some of those faculty members should be regularly involved in teaching graduate courses. The faculty member will normally serve at least one ~~for~~ three year term. Any faculty member may be reappointed. To provide continuity and consistency, members' terms will be staggered.
- c) At least four undergraduate students from each college who have at least sophomore status and at least one graduate student from each college. Sophomores will serve a three year term, juniors and seniors will serve until the time they would normally graduate. Graduate students will serve a three year term (or will serve until they graduate). **Students are nominated to serve by department chairs.**
- d) The Provost may appoint new members at any time. ~~If a vacancy in the Board of Academic Integrity occurs, the Provost may appoint a new member to fill the unexpired term.~~

2. The Hearing Panel. A Hearing Panel will be formed to hear cases involving an alleged breach of Academic Integrity. A new panel will be chosen by the Chair of the Board for each case on the basis of impartiality and availability. A panel will consist of the following six members selected from the Board of Academic Integrity:

- a) The Chair of the Board of Academic Integrity, who will be a nonvoting member and will provide continuity among the various Hearing Panels to be convened;
- b) One faculty member, preferably from the college of the course involved in the alleged violation;
- c) Two other faculty members, preferably one of these faculty members will be from the student's college, if different from that of the faculty member;
- d) Two students.

If the Chair is unavailable to serve on a particular Hearing Panel, the Provost may appoint a temporary substitute from among the members of the board. If the case involves a graduate student, the student members will be graduate students, and the faculty members will be selected from those who regularly teach graduate courses.

- c) An accused student or complainant may object for good cause to the replacement member within a reasonably prompt time of the member's appointment, but not later than the beginning of the hearing. The Chair shall rule upon the objection, and, if the objection is accepted, the Chair will select another member of the Board to fill the vacancy.

D. Hearing Panel Proceedings

The student shall appear before the Hearing Panel at the scheduled time and place to explain his or her conduct. The faculty member and the faculty member's chairperson need not appear at the hearing, although each may, ~~with the approval of the Chair,~~ attend the hearing and address the Hearing Panel. ~~If the chairperson attends the hearing, he/she must recuse him/herself from hearing the student's appeal of the grade penalty.~~ Any member of the Hearing Panel may question the student or the faculty member. The Hearing Panel shall deliberate and determine the facts of the matter in accordance with the Deliberation and Penalty provisions of these procedures.

1. The student shall present relevant evidence (which may include witnesses or documentary evidence) before the hearing Panel in support of his or her position.
2. The hearing shall be conducted in a University facility and shall be closed to the public. The Chair shall preside over the hearing but he or she shall not vote with the Hearing Panel. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. Evidence, including hearsay evidence, shall be admitted, if it is relevant and not unduly repetitious and is the sort of evidence a reasonable person would consider to have a bearing on the case. The Chair may, in his or her absolute discretion, admit or exclude witnesses during the testimony of other witnesses, admit or exclude members of the student's family and exclude any person who in the Chair's judgment disrupts the proceeding.
3. The faculty member (if he or she attends) and the student may each be accompanied by one person, whose role is limited to advising the faculty member or student. This person should be a member of the university community (current faculty member, administrator, staff member, or student). Any adviser so designated who is also an attorney-at-law will not be considered to be appearing as counsel. This adviser may not make statements, examine witnesses, or otherwise intervene. At his or her discretion, the Chair may solicit input from the adviser.
4. The student speaks first in a hearing and answer questions from panelists before the faculty member speaks, so the faculty member has a chance to hear all of the student's statements, see the evidence and follow along, and hear the student's answers to the panelists' questions. Then the faculty member presents evidence, responds to the student's evidence, responds to student's answers to questions from the panelists, and then answers the questions from the panelists. Once the faculty member is finished, then the student has the chance to respond to any additional evidence the faculty member has submitted, to the faculty member's comments and to the faculty member's answers to the questions posed by the panelists. After the student is finished, the Chair of the Board of Academic Integrity will invite the panelists to ask either the student or the faculty member additional questions. Once the panelists inform the Chair that they have heard all they need to hear, the student and the faculty member will be excused. The panel deliberates. The vote by secret ballot allows each panelist to make a personal decision as to the preponderance of evidence in the case (i.e. the weight of the evidence amounts to 50% plus some additional amount).

4. Record on Appeal. The Dean will decide the appeal on the basis of the records of the proceedings of the Hearing Panel, the written materials submitted with the request to appeal, and the results of his or her consultation with the parties, if any.

5. Decision on Appeal. The Dean may do any of the following in response to the student's appeal:

a) Affirm the decision of the Hearing Panel.

b) Remand the case to the Hearing Panel, but only if material procedural errors have occurred or if new evidence has surfaced that could not have been reasonably available at the time of the original hearing.

6. Final Decision. The decision of the Dean is final. This decision will be written and shall contain the author's finding of fact and may (at the discretion of the author) include reasons for the decision. It shall be provided to the student, the student's Dean, the faculty member, the faculty member's Chair, the Faculty Member's Dean, and the Chair of the Board of Academic Integrity, and placed in the student's file.

I. Failure to Appear

If the student fails to appear for the hearing, the Hearing Panel will make its judgment on the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing, and the student will forfeit any right to a further hearing.

Appendix C: DRAFT FAQ for Faculty

1. What is the philosophy behind Villanova's Academic Integrity Policy?
Key points: educational, automatic Class 1 for second offense, student may be dismissed for two Class 1s.
2. What happens to a student's record if they are found responsible? What should I say if a potential employer, etc. calls me?
Key points: record expunged, wording to use
3. I believe a student has committed an academic integrity violation, but I am busy and I fear the process will be time consuming. Should I still proceed with submitting an accusation? What are my obligations?
Key points: grade penalty must report, do not have to attend appeal, stats on % accepting responsibility, Deans/AVP deal with parents, helps us determine repeat offenders
4. Will I find out what happens as a result of my accusation?
Yes, the policy states "Once it has been determined that a violation has occurred (either by admission of the student or by a decision of the panel), the faculty member's dean sends a notification to all parties."
5. Can you show me a schematic of how the process works?
Schematic under development

Proposal for Recognizing and Branding the First Year Experience at Villanova University

Overview:

Since 1995, Villanova University has featured a distinctive and rigorous mission-driven set of common courses and residential experiences for all first year students across all four colleges. This year-long experience revolves around three required courses—the “Augustine and Culture Seminar (ACS 1000 and ACS 1001) and Theology 1000 “Faith, Reason, and Culture”—along with a residential component, including residential thematic learning communities.

This proposal recommends that the University take advantage of this existing set of common courses and learning community experiences, and re-name the sequence as the “First Year Experience” (FYE) to better identify and publicize the uniqueness of an Augustinian education.

Purpose of a FYE at Villanova:

Many universities and colleges use a first-year experience model as a transition from high school to college-level work. At Villanova, we have used the first-year common courses and learning communities to nurture our new students in the Augustinian values of *unitas*, *veritas*, *caritas*. ACS is founded on the belief that seeking the truth (*veritas*) with respect and love (*caritas*) toward one another leads to deep and lasting community (*unitas*). Augustine himself serves as a model for our first-year students as they learn to be like him in his passionate engagement with “the higher things”: literature, history, and politics; truth, justice, beauty, and moral values; the gods and God.

The Augustinian mission is thus at the heart of the first-year experience. Through it, we create an intentionally holistic educational environment that links the classroom seminar experience with co-curricular experiences. These include:

- Common classroom experiences using a seminar format that brings students from all four colleges together in conversation centered on foundational questions of self, community, justice, truth, and the life-well-lived;
- Common texts (including the Bible, the ancient Greeks, Augustine’s *Confessions* in ACS 1000; and in ACS 1001, Shakespeare, a range of diverse voices from the 16th century to the present, along with selected authors within the Catholic Social Teaching tradition to bring the Augustinian mission into active conversation with modern issues of justice);
- An emphasis on foundational skills shared by all four colleges, with a focus on a writing-intensive, reading-intensive, and discussion-oriented curriculum;

- Exposure to the Augustinian and Catholic intellectual traditions;
- Electronic writing portfolio; this portfolio stays with students for all four years, and is also linked to two other Foundation courses for CLAS and VSB – Philosophy 1000 and Ethics 2050).
- Interdisciplinary experiences inside and outside of the classroom
- Residential component (all students housed according to their fall ACS assignment; 43% of first year students in some sort of residential learning communities)

The emphasis of the first-year experience at Villanova coincides with many of the “high-impact educational practices” identified by the LEAP Challenge initiative of the AAC&U as best practices for student success. These practices include:

- First-Year Seminars and Experiences emphasizing critical inquiry, “big questions,” frequent writing, and information literacy through small groups of students working closely with faculty;
- Common intellectual experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-intensive courses
- Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- Diversity/Global Learning

(see Appendix III for full description of the LEAP High-Impact Educational Practices)

Villanova University’s first-year experience is unique in several ways. Most notably, we link academically rigorous mission-driven courses (ACS and THL 1000) to a community ethos common to all four colleges, including common texts shared across all sections. In addition, we house all first-year students according to their ACS assignment, and 43% of those students are also linked to a learning community associated with their ACS class.

ACS and Learning Communities

To further promote community and solidification of the first-year experience, all incoming students are housed according to their ACS assignment to create a baseline of a living/learning environment within the residence halls. Commuter students are placed in commuter sections to bolster their sense of community as well.

In 1997, the Office of Student Life partnered with ACS to create the first thematic residential learning community with 150 students. There are now eight different opt-in learning communities which incorporate an additional one-credit theme-specific course; themes include:

- Leadership
- Faith and Learning
- Global Community

- Environmental Leadership
- Art and Culture
- Caritas Service Learning
- Creativity on the Page
- Healthy Living

The Honors Program features residential learning communities for the various thematic cohorts within the program. ACS also partners with the Center for Access Success and Achievement for the St. Thomas of Villanova Scholars learning cohort. In addition, other defacto learning communities have been created, including the house-master models in Moriarty and McGuire Halls, and the “Crossroads” science and humanities cohort. As of fall 2016, approximately **43%** of the first-year class was in some form of residential learning community.

The Learning Communities have proved to be a place for partnerships to develop between ACS and the professional colleges. For example, the Environmental Leadership learning community draws on the expertise of Engineering and Environmental Science faculty; likewise, the Healthy Living learning community has partnered with the College of Nursing for various programming. The Crossroads learning community offers a team-taught classroom experience with a professor of the humanities and a professor of the sciences.

Such partnerships within and across Colleges offer a natural way for new learning communities to continue to develop.

Conclusion

We propose to recognize and brand the existing set of courses and experiences as the First Year Experience, and to create a name for the experience specific to Villanova (e.g., *The Tolle Lege Experience*).

In addition, we recommend that the University **continue to build** upon the framework of the first-year experience to include further growth of learning communities and expansion of other intentional programming within the first-year experience (diversity initiatives, for example, could become more holistic across the first-year experience). In addition, the first-year experience can continue to be an intentional springboard for further programming and experiences in the sophomore year.

Appendix I

Descriptions of the FYE Course Cluster: ACS 1000/1001 and THL 1000

I. Augustine and Culture Seminar Sequence

ACS (originally titled “The Core Humanities Seminar”) was created in 1992 as the foundation of the Core Curriculum in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Over time, each of the other colleges have requested participation of their students in the ACS sequence resulting in its establishment as a common freshman year curriculum experience for all undergraduates as of 1995. Accordingly, all curricular development for ACS since 1995 has aimed at a holistic first year experience across colleges.

At present, ACS provides a common classroom experience across 104 sections through:

- Common foundational readings (including the Bible, the ancient Greeks, Augustine’s *Confessions* in ACS 1000; and in ACS 1001, Shakespeare, a range of diverse voices from the 16th century to the present, along with selected authors within the Catholic Social Teaching tradition to bring the Augustinian mission into active conversation with modern issues of justice);
- A connecting question of “Who Am I?”
- Emphasis on foundational skills of critical reading and writing; writing intensive (30 pages of writing per semester)
- An electronic writing portfolio
- Participation in cultural events
- All students housed according to their ACS assignments

II. Theology 1000: Faith, Reason, and Culture

Inspired by the University Mission of an education “grounded in the wisdom of the Catholic intellectual tradition” this course is central in the pursuit of reflective exploration of the relationship between faith and life. Students of all faiths and cultures develop a more realized appreciation of Christian faith and morality. The course is foundational to the Villanova liberal arts experience and the institution’s Catholic identity. While most students take Theology 1000 in the freshman year, some do not based upon major-specific course sequencing.

Appendix II

Alignment of the First Year Experience with the New *Institutional Student Learning Goals*

These newly developed *Institutional Student Learning Goals* encompass the entirety of any given student's educational experience including focused learning within their major/degree program. As such all of these goals cannot be expected to be incorporated as objectives within the FYE; however the committee believes it is important that the FYE be presented to the broader on- and off-campus community within the context of these educational and experiential objectives.

The FYE supports some of the nine learning goals well, a few not so strongly. Here we outline some thoughts on how the FYE addresses these nine goals and highlight opportunity areas where changes could be instituted.

In Depth Study: The upper level major requirements primarily support this goal, but the readings in ACS and THL classes lay a common base for further study.

Moral / Ethical Behavior: All the colleges have formal ethical components in their curricula, but the FYE also introduces specific ethical ideas via the Catholic intellectual tradition and its commitment to social justice.

Augustinian Values: This is a central focus of ACS 1000 and 1001 and THL 1000. The common readings for these core courses provide a reference point for later courses throughout the University.

Lifelong Learning: No small set of courses can achieve this goal, but senior exit surveys indicate that the ACS sequence had a significant role in their intellectual development and presumably also will influence their future learning.

Cultural Awareness: As the title states, the ACS sequence explicitly considers the role of culture in our lives. This University goal has this expanded interpretation: "Demonstrate an understanding of global and multicultural perspectives of human behavior, achievements, and ideas." The committee believes the FYE lays a solid base for classical and western perspectives on behavior and achievements and ideas. Most ACS sections include some multicultural readings, but it is not a required component. The committee believes that adding more global and multicultural perspectives to ACS 1000 and 1001 and THL 1000 is needed so that these core courses lay a stronger base for "global and multicultural" awareness.

Communication / Research: ACS courses are writing intensive, introduce students to the basics of library research, and provide a good base for future research in advanced

courses. All sections of ACS stress oral communication, and many include formal oral presentations.

Problem Solving: The ACS and THL courses introduce “complex problems” that require “reasoned judgment” so support student growth in problem solving.

Service: Since a good number of ACS sections are tied into learning communities, many ACS students are involved in service.

Leadership: Similarly, the many ACS sections tied into learning communities provide excellent opportunities for leadership.

Appendix III

High-Impact Educational Practices

A Brief Overview (LEAP initiative; AAC&U)

Excerpt from [*High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*](#), by George D. Kuh (AAC&U, 2008)

[Chart of High-Impact Practices](#) (pdf)

High-Impact Educational Practices: A Brief Overview

The following teaching and learning practices have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds. These practices take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts.

On many campuses, assessment of student involvement in active learning practices such as these has made it possible to assess the practices' contribution to students' cumulative learning. However, on almost all campuses, utilization of active learning practices is unsystematic, to the detriment of student learning. Presented below are brief descriptions of high-impact practices that educational research suggests increase rates of student retention and student engagement. The rest of this publication will explore in more detail why these types of practices are effective, which students have access to them, and, finally, what effect they might have on different cohorts of students.

First-Year Seminars and Experiences

Many schools now build into the curriculum first-year seminars or other programs that bring small groups of students together with faculty or staff on a regular basis. The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students' intellectual and practical competencies. First-year seminars can also involve students with cutting-edge questions in scholarship and with faculty members' own research.

Common Intellectual Experiences

The older idea of a "core" curriculum has evolved into a variety of modern forms, such as a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies and/or required participation in a learning community. These programs often combine broad themes—e.g., technology and society, global interdependence—with a variety of curricular and cocurricular options for students.

Learning Communities

The key goals for learning communities are to encourage integration of learning across courses and to involve students with "big questions" that matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another and with their professors. Many learning communities explore a common topic and/or common readings through the lenses of different disciplines. Some deliberately link "liberal arts" and "professional courses"; others feature service learning.

Writing-Intensive Courses

These courses emphasize writing at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum, including final-year projects. Students are encouraged to produce and revise various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines. The effectiveness of this repeated practice “across the curriculum” has led to parallel efforts in such areas as quantitative reasoning, oral communication, information literacy, and, on some campuses, ethical inquiry.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects

Collaborative learning combines two key goals: learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one’s own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences. Approaches range from study groups within a course, to team-based assignments and writing, to cooperative projects and research.

Undergraduate Research

Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students’ early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions.

Diversity/Global Learning

Many colleges and universities now emphasize courses and programs that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and worldviews different from their own. These studies—which may address U.S. diversity, world cultures, or both—often explore “difficult differences” such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad.

Service Learning, Community-Based Learning

In these programs, field-based “experiential learning” with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both apply what they are learning in real-world settings and reflect in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life.

Internships

Internships are another increasingly common form of experiential learning. The idea is to provide students with direct experience in a work setting—usually related to their career interests—and to give them the benefit of supervision and coaching from

professionals in the field. If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member.

Capstone Courses and Projects

Whether they're called "senior capstones" or some other name, these culminating experiences require students nearing the end of their college years to create a project of some sort that integrates and applies what they've learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of "best work," or an exhibit of artwork. Capstones are offered both in departmental programs and, increasingly, in general education as well.

Attachment 3

A framework for cross-college majors

Elements of a policy for cross-college majors (CCMs)

- 1) Draw lessons from experience with interdisciplinary programs (majors across departments) and department with majors in more than one college (Economics)
- 2) Non-major degree requirements would come from home college; thus, non-major requirements would differ depending on the major's home college. CCMs would either have to allow this flexibility or have different with-in major requirements depending on the home college (as with Economics).
- 3) Requirements for major would be set by departments involved (not by an administrator)
- 4) Faculty should be hired into one of the departments for tenure & promotion purposes.
- 5) There needs to be a resource plan -- if majors are coming mostly from one college but much of the staffing load is in the other college, that will create resource problems.
- 6) Should there be guidelines on minimum contributions from each college? For example, what if only 2 of 10 courses come from college A? What alternate arrangements should be considered in such cases?
- 7) How is this handled administratively? Which Dean? Who approves? What subsequent role for APC (if any)?

Feedback from Randy Weinstein:

- For some majors, incoming first year students are admitted into the major (e.g., Sciences and Engineering). Would incoming students be admitted into a CCM?
- How would staffing be managed for specialized courses that fall outside the departments involved?
- Pathway to a CCM should be from cross-college course offerings to minor to CCM (to demonstrate demand and feasibility) rather than just based on a proposal
- Guidelines should be developed for principles behind a CCM, e.g., balance between participating departments and colleges in terms of # majors, # of courses taught in each college.