

[In these minutes: OSCAI Updates, Report from Morris on Academic Integrity Process and Procedure, Review of Pavela Report]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2014

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view of, nor are they binding on the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Jennifer Goodnough (Chair), Ragui Assaad, Kimberly Clarke, Sharon Dzik, Kacey Gregerson, April Kim, Laura Coffin Koch, LeAnn Snow.

REGRETS: Arthur Erdman, Stacy Ingraham, Susan LoRusso, Corrie Marion.

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND REVIEW OF CHARGE

Introductions were made of all members present. Jennifer Goodnough then referred members to the committee's charge, noting that it looks at academic integrity at the system-level, not just for the Twin Cities campus.

2. OSCAI UPDATES

Sharon Dzik noted that in 2012-13, her office had about 300 scholastic dishonesty cases. As of today, the number for 2013-14 is 520 cases. Her office believes that this is due to better reporting by faculty as they do not see the report as punitive, but as a way to prevent students committing scholastic dishonesty in multiple classes.

She then noted that this summer her office moved to a new database, Maxient, for reporting and handling cases, which has made the process quicker. Faculty now can complete a form online, which then automatically deposits the information in the database. It also pulls data from People Soft. This semester's email to faculty will be sent in a few weeks and will include information on the new reporting software.

Lastly she said that her office is going forward with a program to deal with scholastic dishonesty complaints in a restorative justice format. [This program was discussed with the committee in October 2013.] The program will only be used for first-time, minor violations and provide a learning experience for the accused student. Her office is trying to develop a name for the program, so she handed out four options and asked members to vote.

3. REPORT FROM MORRIS ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCESS AND PROCEDURE

Jennifer Goodnough said that she would like the committee to hear from each campus regarding how it handles scholastic dishonesty. Therefore she is presenting information on this process at Morris. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Sandy Olson-Loy, is responsible for Student Conduct Code violations at the campus. However, the Morris Assembly Constitution then provides authority for academic integrity and its violations to the Scholastic Committee. There is then a subcommittee that holds hearings. As the Morris representative to SAIC, she serves as chair of the hearing body along with two faculty and two students. The goal is for all cases to be

resolved informally between the faculty and student, but the hearing body exists in case the student is contesting the allegation or the sanction. An appeal of the hearing body decision is then made to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

She noted that another reason for students to go to a hearing is due to persistent violations, which has been seen more often on campus. This is likely a result of better reporting by faculty. She believes that the rationale for increased reporting is that the campus has created a culture of making reports stemming from academic alerts. This is an opportunity to make a report, similar to a mid-term alert, if a student is missing class, not completing assignments, or having other issues. If faculty are making these types of reports, they may also see the value in scholastic dishonesty reports.

Since 1999, Morris has had 150 cases reported, but 85 of those cases have been in the last four years. In 2012-13, there were 56 instances due to groups of students being reported for cheating together. The current student population is 2000. While there have only been two hearings for contested violations in the last 14 years, she believes that this might increase if more students are cited for multiple violations. However, multiple student violations recently dropped after word spread that a few students were suspended. The biggest challenge for sanctioning students for multiple violations is that there is not much in terms of sanctions between probation and suspension. To the best of her knowledge, Morris has only seen one appeal of a hearing decision.

Jennifer Goodnough said that an advocate at Morris is copied on all letters to international students, meets with them to explain their options, and can be a liaison at hearings. Information is also shared with these students at international student orientation and during a freshmen class – Introduction to the American University.

Sharon Dzik reminded members that Twin Cities faculty are also encouraged to meet with the students and decide the sanction. However, her office does require international students to meet with her office so that they understand the process, their rights, and the consequences for a second violation. OSCAI also meets with all students involved in a scholastic dishonesty case with other students.

Jennifer Goodnough would like to see more sharing of information and files between the campuses as many students take classes at other campuses or transfer.

Sharon Dzik noted that file sharing will be very easy once each campus is using Maxient.

Q: What types of cases are seen?

A: Plagiarism is reported most often at Morris and in the Twin Cities, but there are also cases of cheating and unauthorized collaboration. Morris faculty want to make sure that they are clear on an incident before reporting and plagiarism is usually the easiest to identify.

Q: Is guidance provided to faculty on what sanctions to propose?

A: Yes. Morris has taken the OSCAI guidelines and made some modifications. The division chairs and former Scholastic Committee members are also able to guide faculty. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs will not add sanctions unless there is a hearing or multiple violations.

Members made the following comments:

- Advisors are slowly starting to share information between campuses as well

- OSCAI has the ability to apply additional sanctions on top of what was decided by the faculty if it is an egregious case or involves multiple violations

4. REVIEW OF PAVELA REPORT

Jennifer Goodnough said that this report was shared with her as it provides advice to faculty from students on protecting academic integrity. She thought that something similar could be developed for the University. It would be a way to provide basic reminders for faculty about academic integrity and show what resources are available to students.

Members made the following comments:

- Pavela report language on building to a major paper and requiring smaller writing assignments first is helpful
- Faculty should be aware that students can instant message during an exam if they are allowed to use a device on a test
- Faculty will always be behind in preventing cheating methods for students who really want to cheat, therefore a proactive culture of academic integrity is easier to establish than a reactive approach

Q: Has an honor code been considered for the University as a way to instill a culture of academic integrity?

A: It has been considered, but due to the University's large size, it works better at the college or unit level. Also, for an honor code to be successful, it needs to be student-driven, not imposed top-down.

Members agreed that a document should be created and discussed at the next meeting.

5. DISCUSSION OF ITEMS FOR 2014-15

Members had the following agenda items:

- Share pre-orientation survey results regarding the questions on academic integrity and discuss possible follow-up
- Revisit the process charts for OSCAI communications on individual scholastic dishonesty cases

6. OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, Jennifer Goodnough thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate