Office of Student Conduct Assessment Report 2021-24

Who We Are

The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) is responsible for administering the CSU student disciplinary process at Sacramento State. OSC reports and reviews alleged student misconduct before determining if the University will pursue disciplinary action. University discipline can be concurrent with civil or criminal actions and is a separate process from the residence hall disciplinary system.

Overall Statistics, 2021-24

Category	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
All Cases Summary	706	604	792
Unique Cases Created	400	438	501
Incident Reports	426	458	529
Charges	641	534	539
Sanctions	315	318	355
Letters Sent	994	872	1205
Days to Turnaround Case Incident to Closed	31.7	28.39	26.93
Top Locations Incident Occur	267 Canvas and 190 Online	250 Canvas and 126 Online	252 Canvas and 152 Online

Information Specific to Academic Dishonesty

Category	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Academic Referrals	503	452	474
Artificial Intelligence Referrals	0	105	TBD
Academic Recidivism	n/a	27	35

Academic Dishonesty Outcomes

Outcome	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Expulsion**	0	1	0
Suspension**	0	1	1
Disciplinary Probation**	8	10	8
Judicial Educator**	83	101	119

Academic Integrity Seminar**	3	2	35
Warning**	84	54	42
Notice of Action	395	296	257
Admin Notice or No Charges**	28	9	24

** Cases are resolved with more than one action

Information Specific to Non-Academic Misconduct

Category	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Non-Academic Student Misconduct	133	96	110
Total Non-Academic Case Files (Individuals)	190	152	256

Non-Academic Misconduct Outcomes

Outcome	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Anger Management with Essay**	0	0	2
Denial of Access to Campus or Persons**	11	9	14
Disciplinary Probation**	16	17	20
Drug Assessment with SHCS**	1	0	1
Educational and Remedial Sanctions**	3	0	0
Judicial Educator**	36	38	49
No Contact Order**	5	11	18
Reflection Paper**	2	6	8
Restitution**	2	3	2
ScreenU Alcohol and CHOICES**	7	0	4
ScreenU Cannabis and Weed It Out**	0	0	5
Suspension**	2	5	3
Warning**	50	31	20

** Cases are resolved with more than one action

Faculty Survey Spring 2023

Summary

The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) conducted a survey of faculty in Spring 2023 to assess faculty's experience with the conduct process and identify areas of improvement. Faculty were asked if they had encountered student academic misconduct and, if so, if they had submitted an incident report to the OSC. If they had encountered misconduct but hadn't submitted a report, they were asked a series of questions to explore why they hadn't reported. If they had submitted a report, they were asked a separate series of questions to assess their satisfaction with the OSC's communication, actions, outcomes, and overall experience with the conduct process. In

summary, communication, fairness, and overall experience were rated the highest. Satisfaction with the outcome of the conduct process was rated lower. The ratings and narrative responses indicated several areas that could use improvement. Recommendations and next steps for improvement are detailed at the end of this report.

Survey Results

- **Question #1:** Have you encountered Academic Dishonesty by students at Sacramento State? (n = 67)
  - Yes: 94%
  - No: 6%
- **Question #2:** Have you ever submitted an academic dishonesty incident report to the Office of Student Conduct? (n = 67)
  - Yes: 84%
  - No 16%

Of the faculty who replied that they HAD encountered academic dishonesty but had NOT submitted an incident report to the Office of Student Conduct, this is how they replied to the follow-up questions:

- **Question #3:** Are you aware that all incidents are required to be reported? (n = 6)
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 50%
- **Question #4:** Do you know where the form is to submit an incident report? (n = 6)
  - Yes: 17%
  - No: 83%
- **Question #5:** What factors stopped you from submitting an incident report?
  - Factors mentioned included not knowing what the consequences would be to the student; wanting to avoid a protracted administrative process; not thinking they would be able to prove it and that administration would not support them; the student agreed to re-submit the assignment; time; ambiguity; students not understanding rules around plagiarism; unclear process; and impression that there is an extreme burden on the professor to prove the misconduct.
- **Question #6:** Is there anything the Office of Student Conduct could do to support you in submitting an Incident Report in the future?
  - Responses included needing more clarity around the process and consequences, guidance on how to identify ai-related misconduct, and examples of reports for common misconduct issues.

Note: The following questions were asked only of the faculty who replied that they had submitted an incident report to the Office of Student Conduct.

- **Question #7:** How would you rate the communication you received from the Office of Student Conduct? (n = 52)

Rating	Percentage
Excellent	35%
Very good	29%
Good	10%
Fair	13%
Poor	13%

- **Question #8:** How would you rate your satisfaction with the action(s) taken by the Office of Student Conduct? (n = 53)

Rating	Percentage
Very satisfied	38%
Somewhat satisfied	19%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26%
Somewhat dissatisfied	11%
Very dissatisfied	6%

- **Question #9:** How would you rate your satisfaction with the outcome(s) of the conduct process? (n = 53%)

Rating	Percentage
Very satisfied	30%
Somewhat satisfied	19%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30%
Somewhat dissatisfied	15%
Very dissatisfied	6%

- **Question #10:** How fair did you feel that the Office of Student Conduct was in their handling of the incident? (n = 51)

Rating	Percentage
Very fair	41%
Somewhat fair	22%
Neutral	33%
Somewhat unfair	2%
Very unfair	2%

- **Question #11:** Did you encounter any challenges or difficulties during the incident process?
    - Yes: 23%
    - No: 77%

- **Question #12:** If so, please describe.
  - Several comments indicated difficulty with students, including a student not admitting to wrongdoing, a student not understanding what they had done wrong, and a student enacting misconduct in multiple courses but the report from OSC only indicated a one-time issue.
  - Three comments indicated challenges finding evidence or institutional support around AI-related academic dishonesty, including a comment that the Academic Honesty Policy had last been updated in 2021 and had no guidelines around AI.
  - Several comments indicated dissatisfaction with the response from OSC, including one that reported being caught off guard that OSC named them in the letter to the student, one wishing for a stronger response, one perceiving a lack of transparency in the process, and one feeling that OSC does not take academic misconduct seriously.
  - Two comments related to wanting more guidance around submitting a report and detailing the incident.
- **Question #13:** Would you recommend the Office of Student Conduct to other faculty members who may need to report incidents of academic dishonesty? (n = 48)
  - Yes: 90%
  - No: 10%
- **Question #14:** Why or why not?[1]
  - Many responses related to policy or procedural compliance, indicating that reporting was a university policy and that it was the best or only way to handle academic dishonesty.
  - Multiple responses highlight the importance of maintaining centralized records for identifying patterns and repeat offenders.
  - Reporting was seen as a way to maintain fairness and consistency in academic standards.
  - Several responses indicated appreciation for the support and guidance provided by the OSC and for the timeliness and professionalism of the response.
  - Some respondents viewed the process as an important learning experience for students.
  - There were some mixed opinions on effectiveness, including feeling the process was too lenient or communication was poor.
  - There was recognition of the value of a centralized, third-party approach to academic dishonesty and not having to handle these issues alone.
  - Some responses indicated confusion or uncertainty related to whether reporting is mandatory or optional and the impact or purpose of reporting.
  - A couple of reponses mention a concern about high rates of academic dishonesty.

---

[1] Analyzed using Claude.ai

- **Question #15:** How would you rate your overall experience with the Office of Student Conduct during the process? (n = 47)

Rating	Percentage
Excellent	36%
Very good	23%
Good	21%
Fair	15%
Poor	4%

- **Question #16:** Is there anything that the Office of Student Conduct could have done differently to improve your experience during the conduct process?
  - Many respondents express a desire for better communication throughout the process, including follow-up information on the outcome and more personal communication methods.
  - Faculty want more transparency about the consequences and outcomes of reported incidents, with clearer, less bureaucratic language in communications and more detail.
  - Faculty suggested more education and outreach, including proactive education of faculty about the reporting process, periodic reminders, FAQs, and examples of thorough reports.
  - Process improvements were suggested. These included suggestions to simplify the reporting process to make it less time-consuming, requests for the office to take more responsibility in resolving cases, and requests to be informed before students are contacted about reports.
  - A few responses suggested more serious consequences for academic dishonesty, including a requirement that all reported students should meet with OSC.
  - Many faculty expressed desire for a better feedback loop, describing frustration with not knowing the outcomes of reports and a desire for updates on incidents reported and their consequences.
  - Some responses expressed a need for recognition that these situations are emotionally challenging for faculty and that faculty need validation of these feelings and experiences.
  - Some responses indicate satisfaction with the current process, praising the office's support and quick handling of complaints.
  - A few responses suggest including more affirming messages for students, not just punishments.

Next Steps

- **Increase Awareness, Transparency and Clarity:**
    - Provide more information to faculty about the consequences of academic dishonesty, the reporting process and importance of reporting:
        - Update website to better present this information. Provide examples or flowcharts illustrating common student misconduct issues.
        - Create handout for faculty.
        - Distribute through Senate, ask Provost to distribute.
        - Submit monthly bulletin postings.
        - Track the communication efforts.
    - Address privacy concerns related to faculty names being included in letters to students without prior notification. (Update incident reporting form to provide clarity on what is shared.)
    - Enhance communication between the Office of Student Conduct and faculty who submitted incident reports:
        - Provide updates to faculty on the progress and resolution of reported cases.
        - Beginning Fall 2023 – create Maxient tasks and email faculty outcome notifications with additional details.
        - December 2023 began including faculty on notification letters from their submitted cases.
- **Training and Consultation:**
    - Offer training sessions or consultations for faculty before they submit incident reports. (Create and offer starting Spring 2024.)
    - Address specific challenges, such as identifying AI-related misconduct, with additional guidance and resources. (Work with AI Czar to start to clarify this as a violation or not.)
- **Clarity on AI-related Misconduct:**
    - Develop clear guidelines on identifying and handling AI-related academic misconduct.
    - Provide specific training or resources for faculty dealing with cases involving AI-generated text.
- **Continuous Improvement:**
    - Annually review and suggest updates the Academic Honesty Policy to address emerging issues, such as AI usage, to stay relevant.
    - Seek feedback from faculty to identify areas for improvement in the reporting and handling process. (Repeat survey end of Spring 2024, then move to semesterly)
        - Review Incident Reporting form to provide information answering their participation and notification in the process.