

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 644<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 20, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

I. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
OPEN DISCUSSION – STUDENT PLAGIARISM

Panel:

Maurianne Adams, Professor of Education – Moderator

Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Director, Center for Teaching

Anne C. Moore, Associate Director for User Services, W.E.B. Du Bois Library

Catharine Porter, Ombudsperson

Senator Maurianne Adams welcomed everyone to the open discussion. The student plagiarism issue had come up as a question from the floor several sessions ago, when we were talking about the notion of open discussions. It had also come as a written question to the Rules Committee. We know that a number of people are wondering about how to identify plagiarism, how we help students to understand that there are honesty procedures, and that “vacuum cleaner” approaches to research are not always the best way to conduct one’s research. We traced the question back, from the issue of academic honesty and dishonesty within in the classroom, to the prior question of, “To what extent do students actually understand about issues of plagiarism and documenting their written work, whether it is from print resources or from internet and electronic resources?” For that reason, we asked Mary Deane Sorcinelli to speak with us first about the way in which we really would be wanting to frame issues of plagiarism, as teaching issues and helping students to understand what these policies mean. Mary Deane will be speaking for about 10 minutes and we also have some hand outs that we can get around to you, that you may also want to get to your colleagues. That will then be followed by Anne C. Moore who will help us think about what are some of the Library sources and internet sources we can use to detect plagiarized material, if we have reason to suspect it. Then, Catharine Porter from the Ombuds Office will be talking about what is the Academic Honesty Policy once it gets pursued with a complaint against a student. This presentation will be about 20 minutes, and then there will be another 15 or 20 minutes for open discussion to go in any direction that participants want it to go.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli thanked Maurianne. She said that it might be helpful if people grab a handout that each of them has brought with them, and follow as they present. She thanked the Faculty Senate for bringing everyone together. All of us have been tackling this problem and we spent about 30 minutes before the meeting talking together about ways we might better collaborate, integrate, and coordinate the resources we have on campus. One idea we came up with was having a one-stop portal, perhaps at the Library. The Information Commons was a terrific spot to stop. It integrates teaching, learning, and writing in that space. We also recommend that the Faculty Senate think about the councils or committees that we could show up at, or create some kind of a working group to move forward on this issue.

She then turned to the approach of the Center for Teaching. The Center takes a fairly proactive approach, in terms of thinking about plagiarism as avoiding it and preventing it. We also see it as an opportunity for faculty to work with students on the appropriate use and crediting of sources. We have individual consultation services where faculty will come in, either with a plagiarism problem, or a syllabus, where we make clear to students the policies and procedures in terms of citing appropriate sources. We have put together some print materials this fall, which will be going up on our website, and also, hopefully, a portal site. One is an excerpt from *High-Stakes and Low-Stakes Writing*, by Peter Elbow and Mary Deane Sorcinelli, in a recently published book on teaching tips. It talks about, in general, and, in particular, preventing and handling plagiarism, but focuses on how to avoid it and how to prevent it. This handout goes out to the faculty that we work with. In our search on websites, we found a fresh and more novel approach. A lot of the material for students, on helping them think about plagiarism, tend to be sort of a litany on the website; just text, text, text, text. We found something at Purdue’s online writing lab which has a continuum. If you are looking at your papers this way, this might be plagiarism, here’s where it is not, here’s what you can do. It is a fresh and interesting approach, and so we’ve been giving that to faculty, to either put on their syllabus, or on their website, or hand out to students in class.

The Center for Teaching also collaborates with other campus services, the Ombud’s Office, the Library, the Dean of Students. In particular, we have worked with Catharine Porter and actually co-sponsored workshops at the campus level, probably during AY 2003-2004. We just did, this spring, a workshop with the Chemistry Department on academic honesty, and talked about these issues with some case studies. What do we do in the Center for Teaching? The issues of consultation, collaboration, referral and workshops summarizes what we do, as well as print materials.

We looked beyond ourselves and took a search on the UMass website. Plagiarism yields a wide array of hits, but there is not a one-stop portal. The absence of such a portal is not unusual. It is true of other institutions, and this includes our benchmarking school and we thought we’d take a look at those, and we are very much the same way. So, if you hit plagiarism on the UMass website, you are likely to come up with the Writing Program, which has some guidelines; the Language Center,

which links you to all the paper mills. We were pretty stunned to see the number of paper mills there are. The Library has links. If you expand the search to academic honesty, you'll come up with the University's policies on academic honesty and the student code of conduct. As we searched other websites, we looked at Indiana University, Bloomington, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and University of California Berkeley. You can see on your handout that there's quite a wide array of resources and pieces of information elsewhere. For example, Indiana University in Bloomington requires all the students in their School of Education to pass an online quiz on plagiarism. It includes a tutorial, resources, decision flow charts, and practice to prepare students for the quiz. If they score 100, they get some kind of a certificate. We are not sure what one does with that certificate, but that is one possibility. At Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, the library is their central point for plagiarism. It has links to a number of other sites on campus, as well as a seminar on electronic plagiarism. University of California Berkeley has a whole disparate set of resources, from their graduate student teaching center to their faculty help desk. We are very much in a place other institutions are, and it seems that this is an opportunity for us to integrate and pull together the resources in a more understandable framework and fashion. We mentioned this fourth school, Purdue, because even though it wasn't in the list of institutions we were looking at, we thought that it's handout to students are one of the more useful pieces of information we came across, and student-friendly.

Anne C. Moore thanked the Faculty Senate for inviting her. The reason the libraries have become interested in plagiarism is because we have traditionally had a role in helping the campus population develop information literacy skills. That includes skills in managing research materials, and managing and valuating information. The issue of learning to cite properly and respecting intellectual property is something that we have heard a lot. We recently, in the last couple of years, licensed a product called *RefWorks* that helps the campus population to manage their citations and create bibliographies. It is a web-based service. The new service that we are in the process of licensing called *Turnitin* is another web-based service that would be available to the entire campus population. The libraries also work with faculty when we have a suspected case of plagiarism, to research that, look into the issue, and do some more in-depth research beyond what you can do with Google. We also look into print sources and academic and peer-reviewed materials that are in our database, or our print collection. We have been involved in that end of it. We also try to work with faculty to integrate the materials into their curriculum. This seems like a good fit, and as Mary Deane mentioned, a lot of libraries at universities are the ones that spearhead the effort to bring awareness and to do an educational proactive role of making students and faculty aware of the issue of plagiarism, that has really taken off and become out of control with the availability of the internet and the changes in the students that are now coming to the university. They have a different way of interacting with the internet and with media and don't really have the foundation or the understanding to really know about intellectual honesty and ethical behavior unless we teach them. That's why we are interested. We can't do it all on our own because of our limited resources, but this has been a really valuable process for the panel to begin talking about a collaborative approach. We think that there are other obvious groups on the campus, such as the Writing Center and OIT, that might want to become involved in this effort to really organize an approach to dealing with, and educating faculty and students on plagiarism.

The product that we did a trial of last spring is called *Turnitin* and it is the oldest of the online plagiarism detection software packages. It is, naturally, by subscription. It costs about \$20,000 a year for the campus to subscribe to it. What *Turnitin* has done is to amass a database of the active internet and about five years of the archival internet. They have been storing that since 1996. Most of the plagiarism instances with undergraduates are usually because they have just searched in *Google*, found something relevant, and copied and pasted it. The fact that *Turnitin* includes, in their database, not just the current internet, but back archive, is most beneficial. They also have amassed a file of student papers that have been submitted to the service at all of the schools which have subscribed to it so far. If UMass subscribes, then our student papers would be a part of that database. You'd be searching that. There also is a subscription set of databases called *Proquest* that the Library already subscribes to. All of those articles, chapters, and books that are in the *Proquest* set of databases are a part of the *Turnitin* database. What happens is the faculty member sets up a course, very much like a *WebCT* course, and they have the list of student names who are enrolled in the course. The student or the faculty member would upload the paper or the project, in whatever form it came in. It handles PDF, *Word* documents, text cut and paste – anything. It is uploaded to the service and then a search is run against that whole database of those three categories of items. Then a two-sided display is given and, on the left side, it shows the text from the student's paper, and a percentage of what it has in common with the items that it shows, on the right. You can click in to these other papers where those phrases are found and see where they came from. Instead of the faculty member suspecting that there is an issue of something copied, going to *Google*, typing that in, and seeing a list of it. This will actually do it side by side with one click of the button once you upload the paper. It will give you all these reports. You can print them out. One of the big benefits is not to catch students and punish them, but to teach them. The first time the faculty member goes and does this, they can see that the student has copied something from the internet. They get together with the student, explain what they have done wrong, and teach them how to do it right. There are a lot of tools in *Turnitin* to help faculty teach them. They explain what they have done wrong, have them re-write that paper, but in the same process, the student is being educated for the next time, for the next paper they write. It is a proactive approach instead of a punitive one. Many students, when they first hear about it, are scared that it is just a way to catch them and have them get in trouble, but it is really a teaching tool. That is its purpose.

This product is not a panacea. It doesn't do everything. It doesn't have everything in its database and it has some technical things that they are still working on. Sometimes it will detect something that is copied and it is already in the bibliography of

the paper. It's showing twice. They are making it more sophisticated, but it is really a tool. It is just one tool in an arsenal to work with the issue of plagiarism and informing students. It gives faculty an easy way to get with the students, and educate them, so that they can learn how to write and how to manage intellectual property. In the process of actually licensing this, they have run into several issues. They would really need to make it voluntary on the part of faculty, and they would also need to get a release from the student. It must be voluntary for students, as well, because their name is recorded. There is personal information recorded, and, of course, their papers are copyrighted as well, and you are loading a copyrighted paper into an online system. So we have to make it voluntary, and we would have to get a release from each student. We would not have total participation in that. That is the basic tool that we are looking at. If we get past the licensing phase, we can make it available. When we did the trial in the spring, we had a lot of faculty try it, and they really, really liked it. It saved them a lot of time and allowed them to switch from looking for problems to, ok, here's the problem. That is what the library is working on right now. We'd like to collaborate with others to get this under control.

Catharine Porter said that this green tri-fold is the shortcut for the Academic Honesty Policy. She highlighted some of the important pieces about academic honesty and the policy. First, she reminded everyone that the Academic Honesty Policy that the university uses is one that was approved by the Faculty Senate, and, as such, should legitimately be the only Academic Honesty Policy that is followed on this campus. That would mean that anytime you had a case of academic dishonesty, you should refer to this Policy. She said this because she is well aware that a lot of schools and colleges and individual departments have their own policy. All charges or suspicions of academic dishonesty are to remain confidential. They stress this because, again, it is their sense that, when a case, or a suspected case, of academic dishonesty occurs, sometimes faculty share this with other faculty. They report it to the undergraduate dean. In other words, there is sort of a little mini database being handled in some of the schools and colleges and she would encourage you to keep in mind that all issues related to academic dishonesty are confidential. The Policy works this way: if you suspect a case of academic dishonesty, and it could be plagiarism, it could be any other kind of dishonest performance, perhaps cheating on an exam, copying, what have you. If you'll refer to the Policy, there are two ways to address it. First, no matter how you address it, you should invite the student in to discuss your concerns, explain what you found and see if the student has a reason or excuse or explanation for why they did what they did. There are occasions when students have just simply misread the assignment, perhaps are new to this country or had a major misunderstanding about what plagiarism and documentation meant. That student might give you that reason. You may see that that is enough of a reason to really make this an informal kind of discussion or charge. In that case, they would encourage you to negotiate with the student, offer, perhaps, a way to repair that by doing the paper over, retaking a quiz, or sitting down and explaining why you were not happy with what you saw. If, after talking to the student, you realize that you and the student are not going to agree about the occurrence of dishonesty, then the Policy would mandate that you file a formal charge of academic dishonesty. That would necessitate a letter in care of the Ombud's Office, stating that you have met with 'Mary-Sue' and, after speaking with her, you are convinced that plagiarism did occur in the paper that she handed in on such and such a date, and as such, you are charging her formally with academic dishonesty. In your letter, you would be asked to suggest a sanction. The sanction would depend on what you think is important to that particular assignment. It could be a zero for the assignment. It could be, in some departments, just flat out saying that any kind of academic dishonesty will result in an F for the course. That is really up to the faculty member. You suggest that sanction and you send the letter to us. We will then inform the student that he or she has been charged with academic dishonesty and has the right to appeal. It is very important, on this campus, that throughout any of the judicial areas in student affairs, students have the right to appeal. This means that if the student doesn't agree, they feel they have a case, they may have evidence, they may have a witness. In that case, they may appeal the charge which means they would have a hearing. That would mean a hearing before the Academic Dishonesty Board. Some of you may be on the Academic Dishonesty Board. We have a group of students and faculty that form the bigger board and every time we have a hearing, we bring three faculty and two students together. If it happens to be a graduate student, we would bring three faculty and two graduate students together. Most of the cases that we deal with are at the undergraduate level. Then the hearing takes place. If the board upholds the charge, then the student's grade will be lowered or reflect that charge of academic dishonesty. Here is the sanction: if you, as a faculty member, decide to give a student an F in the course for academic dishonesty, that F will be recorded on the transcript. There is no indicator that the F is there because of academic dishonesty, but the F will never leave the transcript. The student can take the course again, but the F is always averaged in. This is different than an F a student earns because he or she didn't do anything. They can retake the course and that first F will not count. This is the penalty, the sanction - the grade for academic dishonesty remains. The other part of the sanction is a notation on the student's discipline record that the student has been found to have committed an act of academic dishonesty, and that remains on the record for five years after graduation. Those are the sanctions and that is the process.

I know that many faculty are sort of doing this on their own; sanctioning the student, giving the student the F, failing the student, making up little rules as they go along. It is very hard, then, for us to keep a database. We don't know if we have a student who is habitually plagiarizing, because we have no record, unless you, as faculty members, forward a formal charge to the Academic Honesty Office. One other thing that I would mention, that makes life much more simple, if you do file a formal charge of academic dishonesty, is that you not submit a grade until they have gone through the time period for the appeal; just leave it blank. It is much easier than putting in an incomplete or an F. It should not be recorded at all, or just put little lines on SPIRE. Those are the basic points about the Policy. Obviously, we are really willing to walk you through any aspect of this. We get calls all the time from TA's, faculty members, and, of course, we are very happy to work with students, and we

do. If you've charged a student with academic dishonesty, send her to the Ombud's Office and we will explain the procedure; what we can do, what she should do. Students, of course, feel quite uneasy about the situation. We will sit down with any faculty member and suggest the best way to present the case. That is the nuts and bolts of the Academic Honesty Policy.

Senator Adams asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or next steps.

Senator W.C. Conner said that he is very concerned about the *Turnitin* service. Students can use it and they can kind of play with the wording until they get it going through. Students were being taught, apparently by the Center for Teaching, that what you do is just paste these things together, and then you go and you change the wording so it doesn't reflect academic dishonesty. One or two students said that is exactly what they did. They were advised to do it from the Writing Center. He thought this was a very illegal way to write, if not dishonest and immoral. He wanted to make sure that the Center for Writing was not doing that. This may have been a rumor. The idea that you actually take somebody else's work, and then modify it does not necessarily mean you haven't plagiarized their ideas. It actually means you have, and you are just getting under the bar. Can we change that in any way, or make it so it isn't so onerous to allow them to just put in a piece of document and change it until it gets under the bar?

Mary Deane Sorcinelli said that she was sorry that she didn't have somebody from the Writing Program here, and that she had not heard of the story before. She is the Teaching Center. Another Center on campus is the Writing Center.

Anne C. Moore said that that was not something she had heard of happening.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli said that one thing that we did talk about, as we were talking together, was, if we do work on integrating resources, to have some students work with us so that we get a sense, from their side of the desk, what the issues are for them, and perhaps these are the kinds of questions we could ask students.

Senator Conner asked where we should teach it. The only course that we teach all students is freshman writing. It is obvious that that would be one place. Right now, the burden is on each professor, in each course, to outline what they consider plagiarism, and what they consider they are going to do with the students if they do plagiarize. He didn't know why. It is just like saying, well, he is going to outline what killing is and you are not allowed to do it in his class, but if another professor doesn't tell you that, you can kill in that class. It is something that is dishonest, it is something that is immoral, and they shouldn't have to teach it more than once. It ought to be a school policy, not an individual faculty policy, that this is plagiarism in my course, but it is not plagiarism in her course. It doesn't state it in the Student Regulations, that you will fail a course in which it is proved that you plagiarized material and submit it as your own, but he wished that was a policy. That certainly is a policy in the real world, you'll lose your job, and be sued for all of your worth, if you do it in the wrong place.

Anne C. Moore replied that one possibility would be what Indiana University, Bloomington did which has an online tutorial or test that people have to pass.

Senator Conner said he liked that, and it should be part of the freshman writing curriculum, and a requirement for all students. Where it should particularly come in, as was alluded to before, is to foreign language students, in particular, as they are more apt to do this because they are uncomfortable with the language, and, also in their schools, particularly in the Orient, they are taught to do it that way. They are instructed that, if you are putting together a paper in English, you can paste it together. They don't have quite the same rules about IP that we do.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli replied that she thought that it was a good idea to have a placement in the freshman writing course, but she also thought that it is everybody's job to remind students, in every course, what particular issues are important to you as a professor in terms of plagiarism. She would encourage that as a starting point and then regular reminders from every professor.

Senator Richard Bogartz added that there was a lovely little calendar book, along with rules and regulations that was being handed out to students now. There is a section in there describing plagiarism and indicating that it is inappropriate.

Anne C. Moore replied that we could add it to the first introductory undergraduate classes, but we have a lot of graduate students who are international students, and have not been exposed to this information. Somehow, it has to be integrated into the writing-oriented course in all the graduate programs. Somehow, we have to get it to the graduate students.

Senator John McCarthy commented on the University's academic honesty procedures. His own preference in teaching, and that of his colleagues, is to do almost anything to get an informal resolution and, from what we are saying, it seems like a lot of faculty are doing that as well, and that's a problem. He thinks that we should ask the reason why faculty prefer the informal resolution, rather than going through the full procedure. The reason is that the procedures are not only cumbersome, but fundamentally misconceived. The role of the faculty member in this procedure is as prosecuting attorney, witness, and judge. Judge, because the faculty member is asked to assess the sanction. Prosecuting attorney, because that is exactly the role that

the faculty member is put in at an academic honesty hearing, as he has experienced. He would love to never experience it again. He is the witness because, typically, he is the only person to testify to what is happening. The whole system is really fundamentally misconceived and needs to be changed. It probably needs to be changed in favor of a system where the faculty member is only the witness, and the issue of assignment of sanctions and judging the guilt or innocence, and presenting the case is put in the hands of the Academic Honesty Board. Another flaw that can be pointed out with the system is that the student, for exercising his or her rights to appeal, essentially is punished by having the permanent notation on the record. The student can get an F for the course and accept that as an informal sanction, and then it is an F for the course that is not permanent. If the student thinks that she is innocent, and takes the risk of going through the procedure, then she gets a permanent F and she also gets this thing on her disciplinary record that might keep her out of law school, or med school, or whatever.

Donna LeCourt, Director of the Writing Program wanted to address the question of what we do in ENGLWRIT 112. There is a clear plagiarism statement that each student gets a copy of. It is read out loud in class, and it is covered through documentation of sources. It is taken up in 112, but she reemphasized what Mary Deane said that they don't remember it, or it doesn't necessarily get across. They think it applies only to that class. It doesn't mean that we take that and say that they need to pay attention to that two years from now. She thought that we need to keep re-emphasizing it.

Senator Adams responded that what academic honesty means should be clarified in the context of every new class, in every one of the different disciplines that students are engaged with.

Robert Wilson, Faculty Senate Presiding Officer said that his experience in confronting students who he has caught plagiarizing papers and/or cheating on exams, both of which are academic dishonesty, is that they know exactly what they have done. It is not a question of whether they know or not. They know what they have done. When he catches them, they admit it. To some extent, he thinks the emphasis on teaching students what is right vs. what is wrong is a little misplaced because he thinks that they already know and they are just hoping they don't get caught.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli replied that, in talking to faculty, when they use new teaching methodologies like group projects, or students who study, and sometimes write together, things look similar. There are enough different methodologies that teachers use, strategies, different kinds of assignments, and different uses of the internet. She would agree with Senator Wilson that there are plenty of instances where students know what they have done, but that there are also places where students are confused. They are really struggling to figure out when do you paraphrase something, when do you put it into quotes, how many words can you use, some of those questions that I don't think they think naturally about. Students from another culture think that cutting or pasting is an honor, to use the words of others, but don't always attribute them. She does feel that it is really important to think about educating students as well as penalizing them.

Anne C. Moore added that she thought there are students who do it intentionally, and there are those who are ignorant of the rules. We have to be able to address both. We are talking about an educational approach, when that is appropriate, and as a general rule. There are consequences, if they are really doing this intentionally.

Senator Adams stated that she thought she could also argue that, if one makes it an explicit part of one's teaching, and really address what it would mean in the context of this class, you really are signaling to the student that you will know what it is when they try to pull it off. She thought that it is the silence about it that both penalizes those who are naive plagiarizers, and connects with the cynicism of those who are intentional plagiarizers. Teaching opportunities are important for those who are naive, or don't understand the step from somebody else's thinking to their own thinking, and their own words. It is so easy for us as faculty, and so hard when you are first learning how to do that.

Senator Judith Goodenough agreed with Senator Adams. She runs the introduction Biology labs and teaches several large General Education classes. She finds that, in her General Education classes, students generally know that they are cutting and pasting. They are aware that they are doing that. In the Introduction to Biology last fall, we had more plagiarism than we have had in the past. These were cases where the students really did not realize that what they were doing was wrong. They thought that it was different enough, that you work together but you don't write the same paper. Two women said that they each sat at their own computers, but they wrote the same words on their own computers. We started a very formal exercise in what plagiarism is, and will do it in the fall semester of Intro. She thought that, depending on your classes, you would have examples of both.

Senator W. Brian O'Connor said that he and his wife write tons of letters of recommendation for students applying to medical school. He said that, on their official transcript, there are no indications of any academic dishonesty. Does he have the right to go to their files and find out?

Catharine Porter replied that the student has to give permission.

Senator O'Connor said that, now, when people apply to medical school, if they have been in a disciplinary situation, they have to report that. The student's question to Senator O'Connor is, if he doesn't know, how will they know? This is a common national application, which, if they do admit it, they are dead in the water.

Catharine Porter responded that, unless the school to which they are applying requires a copy of their discipline record, they can say whatever they want.

Brian O'Connor asked if a school can do ask for a discipline record.

Catharine Porter said that no, they cannot. She said that Senator O'Connor cannot access their student discipline file.

Senator O'Connor pointed out that the students are better off not to admit it. He said that it is a different situation when he reads the Monday morning court docket in the Northampton paper because it is public information. He found it interesting, and wasn't aware of the fact that an F that is not erased is an indication of academic dishonesty.

Senator Bogartz added a footnote to the discussion stating that people pay a lot of attention to one form of inappropriate attribution, where attribution is deserved but not given. The quotation marks are omitted. His pet peeve was on the other side of the inappropriate attribution where the quotation marks are put in, but what goes between the quotation marks is not what the person said. Tomorrow, there will probably be a report of the discussion here in the Faculty Senate. Quotes will be used to characterize what people have said here. It will not be the words that the people uttered. It will be what the reporter has the impression they uttered. He would hope that somewhere along the way we could also imbue people with this other sense of inappropriate attribution.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate wondered if any of the panel wanted to comment on the possibility of improvement, in either our policies or procedures, or anything else regarding this issue, which they have covered sort of quickly. Are there other further steps that might be taken by the campus?

Senator Adams replied that she thought it would be appropriate for Faculty Senate councils, such as the Graduate Council and the Academic Matters Council, to figure out how they might want to contact department chairs. She also said that, more generally, faculty should consider this an important issue. There are resources that are available. They are imperfect, but they are a starting point. We are trying to have a more coherent approach, and, if we could agree to this last point, we urge that faculty be very explicit about what plagiarism means in the context of their specific course. We could raise the bar by letting it out and helping students to understand what will and will not pass muster in the course. She thought that it is also helpful to create assignments that are un-plagiarizable. That taxes out creativity a bit, but sometimes we can do it.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli said that she echoed Senator Adam's comments around the need for both clarity around education and sanctions. She thought it might be helpful if we create the central resource to have samples of carefully worded case studies given to students; case studies of good practice that other faculty might have access to so faculty are focusing on the education, and the proactive stance, to the degree they can.

Anne C. Moore added that we are trying to find out how the Faculty Senate feels it would be best to pull this all together. She thought that the idea of having some sort of resource center, or a beginning point - a place for people to begin, whether it is faculty or students - to pull everything together. This would be the one-stop approach which is very popular in academe at this point. She also thought the idea of some kind of tutorial or some type of test developed for incoming students would be a wonderful thing. We have to have the people to work on that, to produce it and maintain it.

Catharine Porter said that one thing that we are doing, related to the Policy is, we are trying to streamline the procedures. We may not address every concern, but we are well aware that, if you read the Policy, after about a page and a half, you fall asleep. That is why we have the Green Faculty Guide for the Policy. One thing she neglected to mention is that we have prepared something for students and we will see if we can get them distributed in the new Learning Center. The title is, "What to Know About Academic Dishonesty, a Guide for Students." On the back, it suggests ways to prevent academic dishonesty from happening and, again, it is an awareness thing. Students need to be cued in. They can be very naïve, and the kinds of situations they find themselves in are not situations they planned. Sometimes they are victims of a situation where somebody copies from them - group projects, team work sometimes breaks down and the student is left looking like he or she actually committed some sort of dishonesty in that project. She thought we all are in agreement that what we need to do is to continually work to help students, but, at the same time, she thought that we have to be mindful that we do not want to have students leave this University bragging about the fact that it is easy to get through UMass, saying you can just do this and this and nobody catches you, and, if you are caught, nobody does anything. That would be a sad message for a student to take away. However we decide to continue with the Academic Honesty Policy, students need to be aware that any kind of academic dishonesty is simply not acceptable, that it should be called to their attention, and some sort of sanction handed out as a result of that.

Senator Steven Tracy said that he used *Turnitin.com* last year and thought it was wildly successful. People can't turn something in, and if it doesn't pass muster, take it back and turn it in again. He then asked, does the student permission policy of *Turnitin* mean that in your syllabus you can say, "I am going to use this," and, if they continue to take the class is it implied that they agree to allow to have it submitted?

Anne C. Moore replied that it is possible, but that we are still working things out and are still in the licensing phase.

II. REGULAR MEETING

A. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the Graduate Council for Academic Year 2004-2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-007.

This report was received.

D. Anthony Butterfield, Chair of the Graduate Council, mentioned that they now have a permanent Graduate School Dean, John Mullin.

B. NEW COURSE (10 Minutes)

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
JUDAIC 374	"Culture & Immigration in Israel"	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course JUDAIC 374, as recommended by the  
03-06 Academic Matters Council.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

C. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-008 with Motion No. 04-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations, as presented in  
04-06 Sen. Doc. No. 06-008.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance stated that there was good news. The House had passed a supplemental budget, the first step in the legislative process. For the University, they have put in \$50 million for capital deferred maintenance. There is an additional \$50 million for state and community colleges. We anticipate that'll stay in the Senate version. Another amount was an endowment match program. That is an \$8 million program, hopefully being increased in the senate, for all of higher education. The good news this year is that there is some specific language in there that allows the matching money to match capital gifts as well as endowments.

Another piece of information was the passage of the retroactive salary amounts. There are 70 days, by legislation, for us to pay that out, and that date is December 16. We are all sure that we will be able to meet that and are coordinating the University-wide effort. Also, the budget website has been updated for this year. It has FY 06 information and it has actual FY 05, for all funds. There are a number of different tables. The way to get in to it is through News, in the News section, it says budget update. There is a lot of information there.

Michael Gargano, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life, mentioned that the University has an incredible weekend ahead. This weekend will be Fall Open House for prospective students and families and it will also be combined with Family Day for current families. We have 4100 prospective student families that

will be here to view our University. These families represent 21 different states, coming from as far away as Hawaii, Colorado, and Georgia. Many of your offices are involved in all the activities going on, so we certainly appreciate that. Also, we have 1200 families of current UMass Amherst students and families returning to campus. On the admission front, not only are we excited about the 4100 families coming this weekend, but campus tours have reached a very high peak. The interest in the University, both at college fairs and other receptions that we have hosted, continues to be on a rise. That is very good news for the institution. On an updated note, in the beginning of October, there were some incidents with two fraternities up on North Pleasant St., and a stabbing incident as well. Earlier this week, the Amherst Police Department turned over the case to us and today we have imposed an interim suspension on the two fraternities, which is loss of University recognition, and they must cease their operations. They certainly have a right to appeal, which is expected, and we will hear it and move forward with that. Now that it is turned over to them, we are moving very rapidly on this.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Ernest May wanted to add one alert item. The Faculty Senate Office and the Deputy Provost are, under current policy, the arbiters of requests for cross-listed courses. We currently have a policy about cross-listing which sets the bar pretty high in terms of the need for cross-listing. There is a feeling among some faculty that the bar is too high. If both departments agree that courses should be cross-listed more easily, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of many of the courses that we teach, they should be allowed to cross-list. The Academic Matters Council is studying this issue and will be producing a report. He wanted to alert the Senate that it is likely that they will be coming up with a policy which still creates standards, but will make it somewhat easier, provided that both departments support the cross-listing, that the titles are the same, the descriptions are the same, and the content is exactly the same. That will result in catalogue bloat, as it has been called, but it seems to be the will of the faculty that we move in this direction. If there are any comments on that, we will be happy to get them.

E. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Marilyn Billings announced that on Friday, October 21, there will be the grand opening of the Learning Commons on the main floor of the Library. She said that it is a completely transformed place. She suggested that people come to the formal ceremony at 10 a.m., and have those new students come in over the weekend.

---

The 644<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:42 p.m. on October 20, 2005.  
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate