ICAI Canadian Consortium Table Discussion Notes
March 7, 2019

Contract Cheating – Hot topic table

First Session (MacEwan University, Douglas College, UTSC)

- Institutions are concerned about the proliferation of businesses that call themselves a tutoring services to students seeking help
- They are providing guarantees
- Also concerns with shadow courses
- Legal issues with these companies, try to send cease and desist
- They are interacting with the student's before they even arrive in Canada or on campus
- Issue is where do we draw the line
- The shadow courses are offered on campus, and the teachers have been teaching assistants
- Hope that through education, we can try to do redirect the student to other legit resources
- Because the material is often printed in another language, they are advertising in ways that are outside the institutions community – such as WE chat.
- If its not WE chat, we don't always know what are the other social media platforms that are being used
- We need to focus on driving home the message of why would you pay for additional services when you can get services on campus
- When do we share the information to students, during orientation may not be be the best time
- Orientation, each new modules, reminders throughout the term
- The culture of the community, which is hard for a general arts and science program
- Consider the co-op or experiential learning piece, for a connection to the students
- Struggle with the perception that international students are the problem.
- How do we talk to faculty about contract cheating?
- We share the results of the cases and will begin to track 'contract cheating' as a new category
- How do you define contract cheating for policy, as it falls under plagiarism and unauthorized aid?
- Without a community of support, do students cheat more?

Second Session (Mount Royal, Ryerson)

- Working with student learning services to support students
- Looking at prevention side of things
- There is a sharing culture with students
- Commercial contract cheating - Posting rubric and assignments online
- Posting the course outline and then ghostwriters bid on the assignment
- Some instructors are savvy, and could check the IP address
- Question of how to introduce this
- Hard to ensure evidence for the allegation

Table Discussions: Engaging and Supporting Faculty in Academic Integrity
(Moderator: Angela Clark)

Discussions for this topic focused on both the challenges that faculty regularly face when it comes to academic misconduct as well as how faculty can best be supported and empowered.

In terms of challenges, we discussed how some faculty members either ignore cases of academic misconduct altogether or provide a "light" sanction. Groups felt that the reasons for under-reporting are largely fear-based - faculty could be afraid to broach the topic of academic integrity in their classrooms; they could be afraid of having a difficult conversation with a student; they could be afraid of the consequences of reporting for the student, or the process of reporting could seem daunting. As well, time is a deterrent: it takes a lot of time to investigate and report (some cases are complex) and part-time faculty are typically not paid to do so.

However, the groups also brought up the implications of not reporting: multi-offenders get away with it, graduates continue the same dishonest behaviour once they're in the workforce, and students could be missing out on getting the help they need. In regards to this last point, it was mentioned that cheating is typically a sign of a particular problem the student is struggling with and by addressing the behaviour, students can be referred to the supports they need. Administratively, in order to better support faculty, changes in the reporting structure can be made, such as having Associate Deans/Chairs deal with these matters instead, making the reporting process as easy as possible, making the process explicit to all faculty, paying part-time faculty when they deal with academic integrity issues, and building in some resources for faculty to use when addressing academic misconduct (e.g. a standardized letter). Training for faculty is important in order to empower them and topics could focus on how to "teach" academic integrity, how to recognize a teachable moment, and how to have difficult conversations with students in order to lessen the fear faculty members may experience and to better retain their relationships with their students.

Engaging and Supporting Students in Academic Integrity

Engage
- Peer to peer (research supports this approach)
  - Library Ambassadors, AIA, Passport activity
  - Career boost students engage; compensate students for their involvement
  - Multiple touch points through year/s
  - Student federation/union partnered with Library to do AI Passport (30min-45 workshops; already exist) - $5 cafeteria and enter into grand prize (iPad).
  - Swag and candy- incentives
  - Fairs, tables, orientation- be visible on campus
  - Engage with decision makers e.g. Associate deans are the decision makers- need to engage with them so they can support students e.g. reality of students' lives- mental wellness, time management. Also, so they also know about services available for students.

Support
- Senior management support e.g. president at Seneca goes to everything
- Faculty talk about their experiences with integrity/why it is important to them
- Help them understand the grey areas "I wish I'd known; I didn't know I couldn't do it"
- You are not a bad person, just need support the understanding of behavior
- Student Advocates
- Student support people at sessions (dad, friend, etc.)
- Faculty also have another set of ears
- Google drive with resources
- Embedded quizzes into course
- Not just about academic integrity/misconduct- personal values
- Not just look at what students did but why they did it
- Have to hear the story of the student- the why and then can refer students
- Student Support and conduct position created
- Pre-departure module- introduction to responsibilities, what to expect, etc.
- Any time when want to change culture need to be multipronged- faculty, student groups, admissions e.g. shadow courses (getting to students before they get here)
- dispel myth that education is just to get through vs. recognize that its ok
- Ike Okafor- 'community of support'- what is wrong with parent doing work vs. buying
- Support/$$ for faculty to engage with students
- "Students cheat because they feel cheated"

Challenges
- How do you have a consistent and uniform message considering how diverse the students and the programming.

Case Management

Key issues, what should we do, how should we do it?

Overall feedback:

1. **Resourcing**. The volume of cases can be high and staffing numbers of those offices are low. Staffing was mentioned frequently.
2. **Timeliness**. Important for both faculty and students, to reach an outcome within an appropriate timeframe. Some reported that they have requirements for reports to show how many cases were resolved in 6, 9, 12 months. If the case happens around holidays it can prolong the process.
3. **Transparency** for stakeholders. During the process are stakeholders able to follow the process, be updated on the resolution, if they wish?
4. **Compliance**. Particularly faculty – some instructors won't follow the process, some wont report a misconduct violation. Identify the barrier to reporting for faculty. Is it the removal from the process once it's initiated, or the time/ difficulty in compiling the evidence for the case?
5. **Consistency**, in terms of the process and the applied penalties. Is it consistent or is it fair? Does the process take other circumstances into account? Can you have both consistency and fairness? There are differences in who manages the cases and the outcomes between the institutions. There are AI offices who make decisions, Associate Deans and even instructors.
6. **Technology**. A case management system that is built for purpose, able to compile reports and is integrated with other system across the institution. It needs to be able to track repeat cases, potentially allow stakeholders to follow, capture all offences, including teachable moments and making some cases a priority based on individual circumstances.

Session 1
What is the definition of case management: Start to finish – moment of allegation to resolution.

Issues
- Timeliness of process
- Strict timelines in policy
- Transparency for stakeholders
- Compliance – faculty specifically

What would be useful?
A case management software that can be used from start to finish that fits academic and non-academic cases that is in one specific location. Currently pockets of things in different places across the institution. Ryerson have a centralised system that has been in place for 10 years (Inhouse) – faculty use it, the scheduling goes out from AIO. Do all stakeholders have access?

Social Media Canadian Consortium Day

Question #1

Do your organizations have policy re: responsible use of social media?

Most participants were not completely sure if existing organizational policies had specific language devoted to responsible social media use. One organization (University of Waterloo) had an Policy 73--Intellectual Property Copyright Guidelines piece that incorporated information about expectations and limitations to posting information without a person's permission (e.g. images, notes, etc from lectures-- https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/integrity-students/intellectual-property-copyright-violations https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-73-intellectual-property-rights)
Humber has a draft policy that has not yet received final approval.
- Unsure of existing policy at
- Intellectual Property Copyright Guidelines
  - Waterloo--Policy about sharing notes, powerpoints etc exclusive belong to instructor & are not allowed to post without express permission—linked on a lot of different spots on social media (e.g. instragram, library site—not included link to the policy [general statement on syllabus]
  - May be included in some organization's academic integrity policies with broader language so that it allows for some discretion in application of the policy
  - Some thought language may exist in resident (non-academic)

Question #2

Are you seeing issues related to social media (departments from academic integrity)?

- Seeing copyright infringements, postings, assignments online without permission [students don't think twice about it]
- Sharing images without permission
- People ratting out other classmates re: about cheating on various social media platforms
- Reddit using it to get help outside of school
- Fraudulent notes – communicated through social media to learn how to cheat
- When looking at issues does it tie back to educational organization
- Seeing issues with breach to professional courses of study (ex. Posting images of clients, organizations)
- Maligning agencies where they are doing placements or service positions as part of their course work
- Used to advise others about how to cheat on tests/exams/assignments
- Worries about image portrayal [in terms of whether it is professional]

Question #3

Have you any interest in exploring social media educational programming/research?

- Overall sense was that most organizations would be interested in topic but no work has started
- Not sure if interest in research around the issue

Conditional access based on role. Instructors can track the progress – there's an instructor interface. Instructors can follow the timeline.

Recording abilities of the case management system – faculty submit everything, including teachable moments where faculty often want to deal with it themselves. This allows the tracking of repeated same offences. Students receive a pending DF grade until decision is made. How long are the records kept for? Retained for 10 years if there is a finding of misconduct. (where does this figure come from? Question from another group). The system is a full-time job. People expect quicker response time, timeliness. The system needs to be user friendly and easy for faculty to use or they won't use it. The evidence is also vetted.

UofA are wanting to look for alternative ways that isn't so punitive. The group had a discussion on bringing the academic misconduct case forward and how Associate Dean are frustrated about lack of instructors coming forward.

Session 2
UofT

Key issues
- Volume of cases – not just as a whole, but the time of year when they come in. Students disappear at certain times of year. Off to see family etc. so that can prologue the process.
- How do you manage the cases consistently? Always playing catch up.
- Cases resolved in less than 6 months. Report asks how many are resolved in 6, 9 , 12 months. In the future it'll be weeks.
- Technology – systems don't talk to each other. Inputting the same thing into three different systems. Takes time.
- Access – having to manually type in the information each time. Now using something that allows them to enter the student number and it all pulls through and everything gets populated.
- Instructors can't resolve the case in some institutions.
- Some instructors don't want to follow the process. There are differences in the evidence that comes forward – takes time for the case team to find that information. There's a checklist for instructors – some tick to say they've submitted the info and there's nothing there. Then the team need to reach out to the instructor – sometimes the instructors doesn't know why they need certain things so offering reasoning can be useful.
- Prioritising different cases for different reasons – i.e. graduation, mental health or anxiety. But not every student will speak up and let the teams known.
- Biggest thing is technology and more staff.

Prevention – esp. during exams. Some of the more trivial issues, like cell phones in an exam. They are more straightforward to deal with, but its not the best use of time.

The student has to admit the offence – if they don't, then it goes up to the tribunal. If the department don't admit – to deans office – then the tribunal. Very legalistic. All evidence based – lawyer. There a possession form – i.e. when caught with a cell phone, take the phone away at the time. Not everyone who spots the violation will report it (too scared) or they do it too late and there's no evidence then. Training gap to handle the situation.

Session 3
MRU

- Technology behind what's needed. MRU use an Access database currently. Funding to pay for a system is not there. The team have pitched ideas but resources have not been made available.
- Need an integrated system – connectedness with security services, student learning services and academic development centre etc. Some shared information.
- Repetitive incidents need to be tracked.
- Can be academic and then morph into non-academic. Can this be tracked.
- Not having a system, not being able to compile stats for reporting (faculty and gender) Faculty actually not wanting that depth. Currently very manual.
- A system needs to be able to pull up reports and stats. Currently, when faculty request it, you have to pick it up manually.
- Follow up with the student after the case has closed. Supports for the student that you can link them with afterwards.
- Instructors receive the letter that was issued to the students and told of any remedial work. Instructors make the decision, not the associate dean. More standardised than if it was from the associate dean. Students commenting that there was no equity. Instructors can get some advice, esp. if the sanction is very harsh.

Session 4
- Volume of cases.
- Consistency – no central office. All cases managed by each school. Who does what? Policy in place to be more open, but they want the structure back.
- Is it consistent or is it fair? Can you have both? What else is happening, do you take responsibility? Are you a first year etc.? Issues with pushback.
- Communication and privacy.
- Some separate from the Registrars Office. Access database. Can keep track of workshops etc. more from submitting paper forms to online and can attach the evidence.
- Academic record and student file (only three people can access the student file – its in the registrars office)

Ideal world
Tracking of the number of offences. All faculty should report. Why don't they – what's the barrier, is it the reporting? Should the committee be able to see what's happened previously?

Sometimes it's not the instructors/ faculty responsibility to see that? Sometimes they don't want to know.

Students can sign up with the meeting online. How long does it take for the process to happen? Sometimes students don't respond. Communication between instructors to keep them updated.

Builds faculty support for the process. Sometimes those conversations happen in the hallway and faculty can see it.

- SFU – Presentation about student's perceptions of AI in Business. Want to branch out and see with other departments. According to the survey:
    o When those posters are around, it seems like the university is in compliance with these businesses.
    o Advertisements on Kijiji, bus shelters around campus, etc.
    o Students renting rooms on campus.
- When we know misconduct has occurred e.g. "lying"; but also shame effect of being in office. How balance
- Refer students but don't know if have engaged with services so don't know if working
- How to support students esp. international students who being taken advantage of e.g. sponsored for elder care; 'star tutors'; shadow courses.
- Domestic students- high school to university- hard to get support because not "fun"; state of affairs re: (vs. international students)
- Equity and social justice lens – e.g. how we support our children; what is at stake- refugees; students don't' come to university thinking 'I'm going to cheat the system" so what is happening. Also, what is conventional? E.g. integrity of your work Universal Values vs. conventions. Deep colonial history e.g. route learning; understanding of how/why critical thinking; Author: Anushay Irfan Khan.
- Plan language expertise- topics, language used- engage with communications people

- Why is there so much pressure on students that they choose this
- Search bots to scour the internet for information on the course
- Anti cheating bots

Session three (Simon Fraser, U of T, Manitoba)

- Taking an online exam, and then send the question was sent to the BOT, and they would pay for the tech support, on demand to answer
- Collaborating as contract cheating, the student goes into the exam, and is responsible for a certain questions, and then when you leave with the exam question memorized, and you share with the group (to compile the answers)
- Years and decades of this type of behaviour
- The faculty feel frustrated that they can't persuade students to not cheat
- Research on the perception on academic misconduct
- SFU – business - Certain course were used to recycle exams, sharing it back and forth
- The posters for CC services are put up on campus for student's – when it stays up, the students believe it is okay by the university
- Is there a conflation of ideas around contract cheating
- Student's do they think they need to pay more money, to succeed at getting the degree
- We need to fighting the notion, that we just 'need a degree', and it is becoming less and less about the learning
- Missing the notion that learning is worth it
- Idea of what if there wasn't any grades at school
- And the student's can fail in the classroom
- Good assessment design could provide an opportunity to fail
- We will remember what we fail and how we learned
- Courses with exams worth 100% places pressure, uneeded
- More frequent exams, rather than a big final exam, and more feedback all along
- If faculty have support for the better assessments they they will use them
- Final essay, submit the drafts as you went along, this helped with the development, time management, and also the ongoing feedback
- Create foundation program for the students that don't meet the admissions, have this foundation program, and they have an extra hour to learn
- Have the student's write an assignment at the very beginning of the program, so there is a sample of the student writing
- But also sets the tone for the level of work

Group Four (U of T, Waterloo, Seneca)

- Built into the student code, that you can't book space on campus
- Pyramid scheme, in the business school, booking space on campus
- Taking down posters on campus - We can talk to the janitors
- Posters are on city poles on campus
- Workshops – how to get faculty to attend

- It is a whack a mole environment
- The language of the essay doesn't make sense, this may be because of google translate
- Hiring the contract cheating ghostwriter to go to the deans meeting instead of student
- Blackmail
- What do we tell student's when they have been caught – you could have been blackmailed – is it worth the risk?

TOPICS discussed – Summary:

- Shadow courses on campus – an issue, one solution was to build policy around the use of campus space
- Discussion of the definition of contract cheating, as how this relates to policy and data collection - the definition is evolving and embedded in other definitions, not always a financial transaction
- Talked about use of social media
- Talked about how we can use technology to support our efforts – and what the use of technology means for evidence in allegations
- Search bots to scour the internet for commercial services
- Talked broadly about student's perception of post-secondary and higher education, and how this has changed over time, and students perceptions have changed
- We talked about assessment design
- Specifically, we discussed the value of giving students the opportunity to fail without hard consequences
- Building this opportunity into coursework, and strategies in assessment design for stress reduction and time management
- Talked about how groups are exploiting campus space for offering pyramid schemes for business students,
- We talked about blackmail, and how student's are unaware of this risk, and this maybe part of the education for students to be aware of