

North Carolina State University
Minutes of the General Faculty
Tuesday, March 20, 2018
Talley Student Union, Governance Chamber
3:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. Remarks from the Chair

Chair Bird welcomed the faculty and introduced the Officers of the Faculty Senate. She introduced Jeannette Moore, Immediate Past-Chair of the Faculty, and Kimberly Ange-van Heugten, Associate Chair.

Chair Bird recognized members of the Faculty Senate and asked them to stand. She expressed her appreciation for the Senators' dedication and service to Faculty Senate.

Chair Bird recognized former Chairs of the Faculty and asked them to stand. Former Chair Hans Kellner was in attendance. She thanked him for his service to shared governance at NC State.

Chair Bird stated that an email went out to the general faculty regarding faculty representation for the UNC Faculty Assembly and the Council on Athletics. She encouraged everyone to review the email and follow the links in order to respond.

Chair Bird announced that Faculty Elections are coming up soon, including the election for Chair-Elect. She reported that elections will open on Monday, March 26th and will close at noon on Friday, April 6th.

Chair Bird reviewed the meeting agenda and recognized Kimberly Ange-van Heugten for approval of the October 3, 2017 General Faculty meeting minutes.

2. Approval of the October 3, 2017 General Faculty Meeting Minutes

Associate Chair Kimberly Ange-van Heugten recognized a motion for approval of the minutes. The motion passed to approve the minutes as submitted.

3. Remarks and Discussion – *Randy Woodson, Chancellor*

Chancellor Woodson thanked the faculty for being a part of welcoming 1700 new first time freshman or transfer students to NC State in January. "This was the largest spring admit population we've had in our history. It's really a growing effort at NC State that we do everything we can to use every available space to make sure we are keeping the university open for everyone that's qualified. And I want to give a shout out to folks in Orientation and DASA

and all the academic staff and counselors that did a lot of help a lot of new people feel comfortable coming into a campus in an off cycle.” He added that for the first time in NC State history, they offered a number of qualified students the option of coming to NC State if they would defer their arrival to January when the university would have more room. “We offered that to over 1200 highly qualified applicants for the freshman class and we were a little overwhelmed that over 400 of them said yes. We estimated about 20% but that shows the excited that a lot of people have for our campus.”

Chancellor Woodson added that with regard to admission for next fall, there are already over 30,000 applications for the freshman class of 4400 students. He stated that NC State continues to be seen as an institution of choice for a lot of people, for many reasons. “One of those reasons is that this is a campus that works hard to make students feel welcome but also because this is a place that affords so many of our students a high quality education for an affordable price.”

Chancellor Woodson reported that almost every national organization – Forbes, US News – all of the rankings, Kiplinger, most recently, ranks NC State in the top 10 of best buys in higher education in the US. “Forbes just ranked us 7th as best buy for out of state students and 9th for best buy for in-state students – which I thought was weird but what the heck – it’s top 10.”

On the faculty side, Chancellor Woodson reported that he and Provost Arden sent out over 20 letters to new University Faculty Scholars, a program that is in its 6th year and is for early to mid-career faculty that are progressing in very competitive ways at NC State. “We love all our faculty but this is an opportunity for us to go through a peer-reviewed process to identify a number of up and coming faculty that are on an exceptional path here. Those awards have gone out.”

Chancellor Woodson added that NC State recently was ranked by Forbes as one of the top 100 employers in the country for diversity, He explained that these are employers that support diversity among their employees and work hard to have a diverse workforce. “Of the top 100 employers, 14 of those were Universities, and we were one of those. When you look at the list, it’s Harvard, Emory, Princeton – a lot of great Universities. It’s great company for NC State to be in.” In spite of being on the list, we haven’t done enough.” Chancellor Woodson added that the university is going through a very robust period of hiring faculty; a lot of that due to the turnover of faculty, and particularly due to retirement. He added that this is creating a lot of opportunities, which is a challenge because with the hiring of so many faculty comes the expense associated with space and start up. “This also affords us an opportunity to really focus on having a diverse workforce at the faculty level. This starts with making sure that we are scouring the world and looking for looking for talent that our students and others will look to for the leaders of the future. I hope you’re all paying attention to that – I know you are.”

Chancellor Woodson reported that on the faculty side, the university has also hit a top ten list. “We are fourth in the country in terms of faculty winning the Fulbright Scholarships. That is a good place for us to be – great universities are getting their faculty to compete for these scholarships.” He added that Dr. Patrick Rand won NC State’s first Distinguished Chair among the Fulbright Scholars this past year. He stated, “Only 2% of Fulbright Scholars receive this designation.”

Additionally, he added, the university has had a number of faculty that have won National Science Foundation career awards this year. “This is a very competitive grant for our emerging faculty and gives them the benefit of five years of funding but also a great designation.”

Chancellor Woodson then gave a shout out to athletics administration, especially Athletic Director Debbie Yow. “We really are firing on a lot of cylinders athletically, and I know a lot of us only pay attention to a few sports. But the reality is we are competing. If you look at the ranking of athletic programs across the board, currently we are 7th in the country. In fact, that promises to increase.” He stated that the women’s basketball team would be playing in Kansas City for the Sweet 16, and the baseball team is currently in the top 10 . “These are good things – the thing I love about it is that all 540 of these varsity athletes are competing hard, working hard, going to class and bringing a lot of distinction to our university. So a shout out to Debbie and all of her coaches who are doing a lot to build excellence here at NC State.”

Chancellor Woodson concluded his remarks by thanking the faculty, staff and students who are participating in the capital campaign for NC State. “We are up to about \$1.2 billion of our \$1.6 billion goal. Our endowment ended the calendar year above \$1.1 billion. To remind you all – that’s a collection of over 4,000 separate endowments. Every endowed gift is a separate endowment, a separate agreement, funding a separate thing. So while I’d like to tell you that I have \$1.1 billion and the proceeds of it to do anything we all wanted to do, the reality is all of that is defined by donors.” Chancellor Woodson added that the good news is that an increasing number of donors are focused on students and faculty. “We have tripled the number of endowed scholarships at NC State in the last five years. In the past year alone, we have created 71 new endowed scholarship funds, totaling over 400 new scholarships. Those are separate funds, funding more than one scholarship in many cases. We are over 200 endowed professorships at NC State now – around 90 something in 2010 – so that is growing. Good things are coming out of this but it’s really 74,000 donors who are making this all happen.”

Questions

(both questions from the audience were inaudible)

Chancellor Woodson responded to an inaudible question regarding the independence of the Athletic Program.

“The facilities are self-supporting, the scholarships are self-supporting, but they are a part of the University and are accountable to the University. So if you think that is different, I will gladly point you in the direction of my Athletic Director, who will tell you who she feels accountable to.”

Remarks and Discussion – Warwick Arden, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Provost Arden brought greetings to the faculty. He then spoke regarding the COACHE survey. “We did the COACHE survey and do so every third year. The benefit of that allows us to benchmark ourselves against other institutions.” He encouraged the faculty to please take the survey if they had not already done so. He explained, “It is a web-based instrument. They say it takes about 25 minutes and your unique link to access the survey is included in the email we will send out for COACHE. The survey will close on April 9th.” He reported that the current leader in response rate was the Library, with a 45.21% response rate. He added that just slightly behind that, at 44.35% response rate is the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Provost Arden reported that there was some confusion with the UNC system office’s employment engagement survey, which went out to both faculty and staff earlier in the semester. “We asked them to not do this survey as the same time as COACHE but they did not

listen. I know many of you have filled out the system employee engagement survey but please do help us with the COACHE survey as well. We look at the data closely.”

Provost Arden stated that they are wrapping up the RPT process for this year. “We have about 100 seeking promotion and/or tenure, and about 50 seeking reappointment.” He added that those will go to the Board of Trustees at their April meeting. He reminded the faculty that they are conducting the final RPT general information session this week, which is very helpful and will cover everything about the process.

He concluded by talking about the turnover we are having in faculty. “We have about 2100 faculty, including 1400 tenure track faculty on campus. In the last seven years, we have hired 470 tenured/tenure-track faculty. All of those, with the exception of about 70, were turnovers. Faculty were either retiring and moving on somewhere or other. That is a massive turnover, with well over a third of our T/TT faculty who have turned over in the last seven years.” He added that looking at the demographics of the faculty today, there are 400 faculty who are eligible for phased retirement. He added, “So when you think about the potential impact over the coming years, that is an enormous amount of work. From my perspective, what I worry about is about making sure we have the resources to continue to hire great faculty and give them great startups.” He stated that we all have to be very thoughtful about the fact that within a 10-13 year period, we will have most likely turned over two-thirds of the T/TT faculty at the University, which is really significant. “We all have to be thinking about mentoring faculty and helping faculty throughout their academic lifespan; new faculty coming in requiring mentorship, transition throughout the faculty lifespan, transition into retirement. “Expect Dr. Stewart and others in the office of faculty affairs to be helping us lead that discussion as we think through the turnover.”

Questions

None

4. New Business

a. Statements by the two candidates for Chair-Elect of the Faculty

Chair of the Faculty candidates Hans Kellner and Fred Parker brought words of greeting to the General Faculty and spoke briefly about their backgrounds and qualifications.

5. Academic Integrity in a Technology-Rich Environment

Moderator: Dr. Sarah Ash, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

a. Each presenter will speak for 5 minutes

Academic integrity perspective:

Thomas Hardiman, Director, Office of Student Conduct

Faculty perspective:

David Austin, Associate Professor, HSS, Teaching and Learning Technologies

Neal Parker, Associate Teaching Professor, Poole College of Mgt.; Faculty Senator

Technology perspective

Tim Petty, Associate Vice Provost, Online and Distance Education

Ken Royal, Associate Professor, College of Veterinary Medicine

Moderator Sarah Ash brought greetings to the faculty and provide background regarding the panel presentation. “This panel came about as a result of two issues of concern that were raised around the same time that both had to do with what happens now when we have this technology-rich environment? Our goal here is to help faculty be aware of what might be happening. I think sometimes we tend to be very naïve about things like this but also come up with some concrete suggestions for things that we might do to be proactive, as well as react to situations that might be happening. We hope that you will leave here with some good ideas.”

Dr. Ash introduced the panel and each member gave a few background details from their own unique perspective.

Academic integrity perspective:

Thomas Hardiman, Director, Office of Student Conduct

“When we talk about our office we really like to share that our office is to educate. Some of the things to talk about with our office are as follows:

Support mechanisms for faculty – We are here to help guide you through this referral process if you encounter academic integrity issues within your classroom. One of the things I like to share with faculty is that you are not the judge, jury, executioner and decision-maker in this process. Leave that to us. That is our job. With our process, you are simply making a referral based on the information that you have available that you have presented to the student that you think may be a violation. We will then take that information, we will take your student’s response and we will evaluate it and act accordingly, under our policies and procedures.

Some of the trends that we are seeing – students cheated 150 years ago and 50 years ago – today it just looks different. Teaching looks different than it did 100 years ago, as do assessments. Making sure that we are taking that proactive stance but balancing out the needs of being proactive with also the fact that if I’m the student, to complete those assignments with integrity. It’s on the students to do honest work; it’s on the students to not cheat. It is that shared relationship between the faculty and that student – students

need to have a knowledge of expectations and from the faculty side, they can do so much to put some of those expectations out there but ultimately the students are a shared partner in that role and they need to be completing their assignments with the utmost integrity possible. Know that my office is here to collaborate, we are here to partner. We are here to guide you through it, because this is not what you signed up for necessarily, in terms of the number one priority for your position, but it's a responsibility of your position."

Faculty perspective:

David Austin, Associate Professor, HSS, Teaching and Learning Technologies Roundtable

"When I raised this as an issue of concern, I asked three questions:

- To what degree are instructors aware of technology-aided unauthorized collaboration on tests?*
- Are there technically feasible solutions for prevention of remuneration?*
- If they are technically feasible, are they legally permissible*

Students arrive here after many years of no child left untested, which encourages them to conflate gaming with taking tests and learning. In larger GEP courses outside a student's major, they will often feel a greater indifference and have little direct contact with instructors. Some will resent having to take the course. It's not easy for students to manage five courses and a couple of labs, 20 hours of work off campus. That puts them under a lot of pressure as well. All of this makes cheating more likely and effective remedies are required.

Cheating is especially difficult to detect and prevent in courses with larger enrollments with no TA's. I'm not sure how many courses are like that but I teach one of them. Assigning essays and papers in courses like that where it's easier for you to control things isn't feasible when you teach 150-200 students. Grading is difficult when you have no TA's at all. What I do instead is give four exams and 20 micro-quizzes – each multiple choice question requires sophisticated reasoning and each question has multiple alternative versions. The order of questions and the choices are randomized and I tell the students I do all of that – I tell them that by telling them that there will be many versions of the exam and remind them that it's not likely that your version is the same as anyone else's.

There are over 130 cheating facilitation sites, social media, etc., that are active and they often contribute materials to these sites or sell copyrighted material to them. My practice is to allow group work because I believe you shouldn't make laws you cannot enforce. I give students up to 24 hours to work on their exams so they can have time to think. The result of the strategies that I use is that the mean score of over 15,000 students is about 62% plus or minus 12%. That's pretty good control after acknowledging what's going on – it doesn't help them very much. I encourage strongly that we collect information about how things actually stand here; I do not know how things stand outside my classroom."

Faculty perspective:

Neal Parker, Teaching Assistant Professor, Poole College of Management; Faculty Senator

"I don't think this problem will be solved with technology. Technology helped create the problem, certainly, but I don't think that technology is going to be the solution to it. What we see here is – it's very difficult for a student to get away with cheating in the lab in which I teach. The probability of them getting caught is just astronomical; everything is recorded. There is no reason to cheat on an exam when you are going to get caught. So what we have here is irrational behavior. To some degree, it's a morality issue and to some degree it's a psychological issue. When you ask a student why did you do this, they just ... I've never gotten a satisfactory answer in a student conduct hearing – they just honestly don't know why they're doing it. So there's that. Also one of the things that people underestimate – they constantly underestimate technology and its ability to bring change, but they also consistently overestimate its ability to solve their problems.

Twenty years ago, if I told you that some of the largest companies in the world would be tech companies or internet-based companies, you would have said I was crazy. If I told you 15 years ago that every single one of you would have an NSA-approved surveillance device in your pockets right now, you would have told me I was crazy. If I had told you 10 years ago that every single test bank had been compromised, you would say I was crazy. So if we're not looking ahead in this, and looking ahead constantly, we're going to find ourselves very very quickly behind the curve. Technology keeps getting better. Think about what's possible today and then think about five years from now, if we don't do anything, you're going to have a really serious problem. Technology isn't going to solve it- it's going to be a mixture of people, policy and procedures."

Dr. Parker prepared and distributed a document with tools, options and techniques and anti-cheating options. He stated that he is experienced in all of them; some work better than others and are very good for catching cheaters. He added that you have to have basically two things – you have to have overlapping tools since no one tool is going to do anything at all by itself.

Technology perspective

Tim Petty, Associate Vice Provost, Online and Distance Education

Ken Royal, Associate Professor, College of Veterinary Medicine

Please see this portion of the presentation here:

<https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2018/10/Academic-Integrity-Panel-Presentation-March-20-2018.pdf>

b. Q and A / Discussion

Faculty Member: I have had a great interest in detecting and deterring plagiarism. One thing I've found with students is that they've been told over and over "don't plagiarize." They have not been told why it hurts them to plagiarize. I am wondering to what extent does our

message goes out to the student body as a whole that the person who they're really hurting is themselves. It's more of a question for us as a faculty; do we teach the benefits to the student, of learning, as opposed to the fear of getting caught cheating?

Neal Parker: The conversation that Tim and I had about this is that we are really of the opinion that, especially during the orientation process when talking about student conduct – when the student is found responsible for some kind of academic integrity violation, one of the options that they have them do is have them go through this training CD and then have to write a reflection paper on it. Tim and I were saying why don't we make them do that during orientation so they know what academic integrity is and why doing this devalues their degrees – it waters it down. They're not just hurting themselves, they're hurting our brand.

Thomas Hardiman: Yes, we have an intervention in our office that has a good foundation for intervention. We have been working this year with the ITT team in DASA to actually transfer the information that we want to put in there in order to complete this academic integrity module. It is going to be geared towards pre-test, intervention, post-test, case study, reflection. The ultimate goal is to have it in our first year as an intervention for students coming through our process. My ideal goal would be to have it as a preventative measure. We have an established approved message that is communicated by the faculty to their students. This is a priority – creating an intervention that is a little more modern—day. We are going to try to take these steps to create an intervention, but the look to the long term is make it more self-preventative.

Faculty Member: Is this something that could be incorporated into courses?

Thomas Hardiman: It could be incorporated into whatever folks like. We would have it available and accessible through our website and whatever course wants to have it – if we made it a mandatory completion requirement, obviously all the things that go into effect with that. The possibilities are endless with that. The idea of getting a module out there, first for intervention and then once we have it for intervention, then taking a more preventative approach.

Faculty Member: So you had said that when there are academic issues we only refer them, but my experience has been that when I referred them – and this happened about three years ago – but the office came back to me and said what do you want to do about it? My experience was that when it comes to a student, anything over a warning is extreme and over-the-edge and it will bring them to tears and become very dramatic. So I have since put in my syllabus that if you cheat on homework, it's a 0; if you cheat on a mid-term, you fail. And I specify that because I didn't want to have to address that and come up with the corrective action after the fact. I know there's not a general policy so there's not a consistent approach. I think that's what we really need so there is guidance that is University-wide policy.

Thomas Hardiman: So if you're making a referral, then part of that referral is a recommendation. So you, as the instructor, get to make the recommendation as to what you feel the penalty should be and if you feel there are any other recommended measures

that would be helpful, given this academic misconduct. We then take it and in 85% of our cases, we take that recommendation and if the student agrees to that recommendation and everything in our review suggests that this is what happened and this is what happened, then we will accept that recommendation. In those cases where we review it and the student either has prior misconduct or the faculty member may have said “here’s my recommendation,” when we evaluate the actual conduct and we see that there was an intentional action to cheat or to plagiarize, there was forethought and there are aggravating factors, we are going to conduct a formal review of that. It may lead to more than just that first violation slap on the wrist. So we may review further.

I will respectfully disagree with respect to the recommendation – and here is why. Each of your disciplines is going to vary and how you assess assignments is going to vary. Included in that is a strata of disciplines and the strata of undergraduate, doctoral and professional work. So the expectations for integrity and the ramifications may look different in different stratas in the academic sphere. And that’s okay. The weight of an assignment and the ability for a professor to have discretion over what the academic penalty should be is then up to that faculty member without restrictions or being boxed in by a set of guidelines or principles. We want you all to have that freedom and that discretion. In the vast majority of cases, we are going to take your recommendation for the grade penalty and honor that unless there is something very compelling that says we shouldn’t. That rarely happens.

I think it is very valuable to have the accountability conversation with your students on the first day of class so that if you do have a referral and you’re having that accountability conversation, it’s really part B. You’ve already had the initial conversation with everyone and you’ve laid out the expectations in your syllabus. It makes it a lot easier to address the conduct on the back end when you’ve set the expectations up on the front end.

Ken Royal: I think the CVM has a good model for this because it’s something we have struggled with. Our faculty sometimes have a viewpoint that any infringement would be grounds for expulsion. What happens is that under those circumstances, students are reluctant to speak up and blow the whistle when they see something if the consequences are that extreme. We came up with punishment that fits the crime and developed a methodology to do that; a couple of years ago we presented to the faculty about 35 different types of academic misconduct offenses and asked them to rate the severity of those. Then we created a ruler that showed that the collective faculty agreed upon as to least severe to most severe. Then we had the Academic Performance Committee look at it and make their decision based on the severity of the misconduct. This might be something that other departments and colleges can do because the disparity between the disciplines is so huge that one size will not fit all, but it may work for your department or college.

Faculty Member: I’ve been working with that committee over the past few months and they have a rubric set up as guidelines. The core value that undergirds that these are students in the CVM and we have a higher expectation on them and they should have a higher expectation on themselves, given where they are in their academic career. That is the motivation that they’ve prompted that feeds into that approach.

Neal Parker: We realized when we were talking that one of the big advantages in the class that I teach is that if the student just didn't bother taking the exam and they get a zero, but they made A's on everything else in the course, they'd still make an A in the class because this class is fundamentally different than other classes at Poole. As a result, I lowered the stakes across the board – the exams count far less than most of my peers. By lowering the stakes, the pay-off for cheating is lower and the expected value is lower.

Faculty Member: I am in computer science and am the course coordinator for our freshman course. I feel like we do a pretty good job of detecting people who have worked together. In the last year, I'm seeing something that I've never seen before. I write up all the projects and the students post them on Chegg.com what I have written up. Somehow that just seems worse than working with another student. We are meeting with Tom on Friday about this, but a couple of questions I have are would the University take legal action against this website because they have posted my material, and would the University get an account at Chegg.com to get the answers that they're providing so we can match them up against the codes that our students are submitting so we can detect who is doing this.

Neal Parker: I have seen the University order a website to take my projects down.

Faculty Member: I have done that. I asked them to take down eight projects, and they took them down immediately. But at this point, the last three projects are all posted on Chegg.com. It's just the thought of somebody posting it there, even if they don't get the answers, just the fact that they would post my project there, that seems much more serious to me than cheating with somebody.

Neal Parker: If you thought ten years ago that every single publisher test bank would be compromised, you wouldn't believe me. One of the things that Tim and I discussed is that we would like to see an ongoing task force that would look into these issues. This is not teaching with technology - this is kind of the opposite really.

Ken Royal: The research literature says that basically any exam items you come up with is your copyrighted material, so the moment you put idea to paper, it becomes intellectual property. So that's the approach I would take with those websites.

Faculty Member: I've had them take it down, but I don't want to even have it there.

Faculty Member: Several years ago I actually would put the academic integrity code in my syllabus and then I would tell my students that if they cheat in my class I will take them to court. I would tell them I had students expelled for doing this in my class and the other thing is that not because of what they did in my class but because they were repeat offenders in chemistry and in math. By the time they got to me and they had cheated on an exam, they definitely didn't want me to report it at all because they knew that was their third offense. So that is why it is important to report and to go through the system.

Thomas Hardiman: We do track, we track all the referrals and all of our cases that come through. We have a database as well. You would be surprised how many times, every semester, we have video footage of a student cheating in DELTA. DELTA submits the incident report to our office, they submit it to the faculty member. We get it in our office,

we report it back to the faculty member. The faculty member says “I don’t want to proceed with the process - I will handle this internally.” We have now started taking a more robust action on this, but coming in, that was the culture that we were addressing. There was a video camera right there that showed the incident.

Faculty Member: There is something we are not talking about here, and that is the underlying “fear factor” of faculty. There is a lot going on out there. I know that personally, years ago, I had *** written on my door and on my house egged and toilet papered just before graduation. I don’t know what happened but someone was mad about something. When you talk about faculty really wanting to report and then some of the crazy stuff that’s going on, I think we have to talk about those in tandem because there are some concerns about retaliation.

Neal Parker: Cited a policy about the responsibility to report academic misconduct to the appropriate authority. So when something happens, am I obligated to report it? Do I have to? That seems to be more or less what this is saying. I know a lot of my fellow faculty members that don’t do it because it is a burden. If the burden was lessened, I think the throughput rate would go up. I’m not saying the process is flawed, but the amount of time all in one day, it basically takes over the entire day because it starts at 4:00 p.m. and some go until 11:30 p.m.

Thomas Hardiman: About 85% of our cases of academic integrity are resolved similar in a manner to you discussed in a faculty member’s office. That is the vast majority of cases. When we are having the hearings, for the vast majority of those, it is typical because we are looking at whether the student should be removed from the university. There are some where the student is denying the charge and will fight it, but generally that is not the case. Sometimes our best effort for everyone does take time.

Faculty Member: It seems like our syllabi are growing every year with information and maybe too much information where you get lost - what is allowed, what isn’t allowed and that adds another four or five pages. And no one looks at it because all of the information is now diffused over multiple pages. At what point do we, as a faculty or as student conduct, decide the excuse of “I didn’t know,” when does that not hold water anymore? How far can they get with that excuse? Generally speaking, when does it come to that point?

Chancellor Woodson: I think if we’re not careful, we can have the same kind of overload for orientation. We talk a lot about everything, so I do worry about this and how we accomplish all of these things. Your point is well-taken.

Faculty Member: I actually have a good answer for that. Is it reasonable that you should have known? And that could be - is it listed in the syllabus? No, but is this a general academic expectation for you as a member of this community? Yes. We cannot be in a position where we have to lay out every single example of what cheating is, but should you know that that’s cheating? Yes. And I think it’s fair to hold our students to that expectation.

Neal Parker: I had a hearing where a student said, “I didn’t mean to do this - to cheat.” And the officer looked at him and said, “Your intent has nothing to do with it.”

Faculty Member: I do think, just based on an experience I had last year, that sometimes to students, maybe it's not so obvious. I use TopHat, which is an in-class student participation program and I discovered that there was a student at home who was being prompted by her friend that I had put up a question and told her to go and open up TopHat." And she did that and responded to the question and I realized later on that she wasn't in the class and I confronted her. And she said I was just trying to keep up with the class, not realizing that I was also using that as a resource of your grade for attendance. To me, I could see her making the argument of, "Oh, I was just trying to stay engaged with the class," but I have learned to put that on in my syllabus now. We will never stay ahead of technology but we always have to decide at what point do we let it ride and say there's a limit to what we can do, and what are the simple things we can do to be more proactive.

Faculty Member: While we are focused here on how students can use technology to cheat, it's worth pointing out that the technology also makes it easy to track them. It works to help us as well.

Faculty Member: Thank you for the well-balanced panel. A couple of issues that haven't been brought up and one of them is disability studies and the way in which they would handle examinations for extreme cases that require special situations. The other has to do with real distance testing. If I am teaching a course and someone in Winston-Salem is taking it, how is the examination to be handled in that situation? There is a big bureaucracy handling that kind of thing - dispersed testing sites and that sort of thing. That would be another interesting topic. I wanted to say that if students don't know right from wrong in academia, just shelling out these syllabi and endlessly picking on little details about things you can and cannot do makes it worse. Because then they look for ways that aren't mentioned there.

Neal Parker: I use Delta's testing center and I had a student this semester who apparently cannot use a calendar. She traveled to Atlanta in the middle of exam week and so I called the testing center and they had a really good solution for remote testing. Can you speak to that Tim?

Tim Petty: For students who are truly distant, we use a service that is contracted through the UNC system office called ProxyU that uses a webcam-based monitoring to essentially watch students using their own computer while they're taking the exam. This includes screen monitoring and the company puts a code on the student's computer to monitor what they are doing so they cannot have another screen up that you don't see. This is one of the solutions that we have, besides working with equivalents of our testing center here at DELTA that exist at other sites.

6. Old Business

Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty

Report on Faculty Senate activities to date

Please view the report on Faculty Senate activities here:

<https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2018/03/GenFac-BOT-Full-Meeting-FINAL-report-2018-Jan29.pdf>

8. Issues of Concern (IOCs)

- a. Issues of Concern are assigned to the appropriate committee. Minutes from each Committee (Academic Policy; Governance and Personnel Policy; Resources and Environment) are posted on the Faculty Senate website so progress on IOCs can be monitored by all.
- b. New Issues of Concern may be presented by emailing Faculty_Senate@ncsu.edu or by contacting one of your College's Senators.

9. Adjourn

The March 20, 2018 General Faculty meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.