

Minutes of the University Council on Teaching
Monday, November 26, 2018
12:00-1:15, CTE Seminar Room

Attendees: Kathleen Bailey, Jeff Cohen, Sam Graves, Kristin Heyer, John Rakestraw, Mike Sacco, Billy Soo, Ethan Sullivan, Patricia Tabloski

The agenda items of the November 26 meeting include academic integrity, teaching retreat applications, a report on TAME grants, and a proposal from the Global Engagement Committee.

Academic Integrity

The meeting began with a recap of the previous meeting's discussion on academic integrity. CSOM Associate Dean, Ethan Sullivan, discussed academic integrity issues

a conversation partner from outside of the adjudication process as an opportunity to discuss possible related reasons for the behavioral issue.

Main Takeaways from Academic Integrity

Best practices (standardized but allow Deans to tailor for each school)

Including a list of ways students cheat would be attention grabbing

“Cheat proof” assignment and exam design

Makeup exam policies

Exam proctoring

Periodic reminders for students and faculty

New faculty and graduate students/assistants need training during orientation about academic integrity

Need data on amount of cheating

What constitutes cheating? Parent editing papers? use of Adderall?

Teaching Retreat Applications

As of the meeting, 3 people registered for the first information session and 5 people registered for the second information session. Suggestions to increase the number of applications include

Soliciting nominations from department chairs, nominations would receive an invitation

Distributing email from Eric Owens (previous attendee)

Discussing the teaching retreat during department meetings

It is not too late to sign up for information sessions, but the application deadline is January 22, 2018.

TAME Grant Report

The committee received about 20 submissions and awarded \$12,787 out of the budget of \$18,727. Four submissions were denied: 3 submissions were not in the spirit of the grant and 1 submission included a 1 sentence justification. A concern was raised that something about the application or website implied the grant process was trivial. Rejecting the application is a good response. This perception could be a product of grants that were awarded in previous years. The committee suggest -2 (eET Q 0.24 G (he) 4 (a)e) 4 (a) 4470 (i) 242 (e250 -1315Tm /250 - (i4 () -10 (m) -2 (e) 4 (e) 4 (t) -2

Next Meeting — TBD