

[In these minutes: Updates, Faculty and student education on the withdrawal change, agenda items for 2010-11]

## **STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)**

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2010**

[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:** Tom Shield (Chair), Sarah Angerman, Arthur Carlson, Dana Davis, Sharon Dzik, Patricia Fillipi, Jennifer Goodnough, Kendall King, Laura Coffin Koch, Francisco Ocampo, Eric Watkins.

**REGRETS:** Andrew Olson.

**GUESTS:** Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn.

### **1. INTRODUCTIONS**

Members introduced themselves. Tom Shield then said that this committee helps the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity (OSCAI) to increase faculty reporting of scholastic dishonesty. While University policy requires that all cases are reported, there are less than 200 reports per year which is close to zero percent when taking into account all the courses being taken by all students each year. Last spring OSCAI conducted a survey on the effects of faculty reporting and now the committee needs to find ways to get this message out to faculty and students.

In past years the committee has worked on reporting procedures for undergraduate and graduate students. Last year the committee started talking with professional schools with the hope that their processes were more regularized but this was not the case. He would like this committee to issue a report to the Provost by the end of this year on what it has learned from the professional schools. It will also need to revisit the reporting process for graduate students once procedures are in place for handling students who were formerly under the Graduate School.

Last year the committee also advised on the withdrawal policy when scholastic dishonesty is pending and the administrative policy on disciplinary background checks.

### **2. OSCAI UPDATE**

Sharon Dzik provided the following updates from her office:

- Two new staff have been hired – Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn who is here today and Laura Knudson; Jessica will be helping with scholastic dishonesty cases and Laura will work with other conduct violations
- Student Conduct Code is under review. She will bring changes to the committee to review once they are ready
- CLA conduct committee guidelines are being updated and she has been asked to participate in this process. CSOM revised their processes last year without her input but is now looking at what other colleges are doing

- She met with Karen Starrey from the Graduate School to determine how the process will work for graduate students. More discussions will be needed but currently she is using the undergraduate procedure for these students
- She will be attending an international conference at the Center for Academic Integrity next week and will be presenting her survey results. For the 99 programs that responded, most want to have a student explain the charge in their file and want to see that there is no recidivism. She will use this data when meeting with faculty and students to show that one report does not automatically prevent student admission.
- Annual report should be done in December and will be presented at a future meeting

Q: What is the process for reporting scholastic dishonesty?

A: Usually a faculty or teaching assistant will find an incident, complete a report, and send it to her office. She then sends a letter to student notifying them that she has received a report and letting them know that they have the ability to talk with her about the incident and challenge the decision of the faculty member. Approximately 95 percent of cases are resolved in this manner. Some students do come in and meet with her and then decide to request a formal hearing, either within the college or from the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB). An instructor might also call her office first to talk about the incident before filing the report. If the student already has a file in her office, the previous charges are noted in the letter she sends.

Tom Shield stated that every instructor has the right to determine the appropriate sanction for the violation in their class and there are no standards within a college or department. Due process protection is an important reason why faculty need to centrally report since otherwise a student does not realize that they can talk with her office and request a hearing.

Sharon Dzik noted that last year was the first year that she received reports from students claiming violations by fellow students. There were three of these reports this last year.

Tom Shield said that while some professional schools have an honor code, there is not one for all students at the University.

Q: Does outreach happen from OSCAI to faculty?

A: It has not happened much due to the increased workload and lack of staff. There is also a question if her office should do enforcement, education, or both.

Members made the following comments:

- Faculty should receive an email each semester on this topic
- When a faculty deals with a case individually and does not report, it prevents finding repeat offenders
- Responsibility for scholastic dishonesty is not noted on a student's transcript
- Current reporting process is not onerous and prevents a student from doing it to another faculty member
- OSCAI should work with the Provost's Office to send out a message, such as on a select portion of the survey results
- Email should go to DUGS versus instructors and include the reporting form and a flowchart for the process; visual media instead of just text would be better
- Scholastic dishonesty should be covered at New Faculty Orientation and department orientations; Sharon Dzik noted that she already speaks at New Faculty Orientation and to departments when requested

### **3. EDUCATING FACULTY AND STUDENTS ON PREVENTING STUDENTS FROM WITHDRAWING FROM A CLASS WHEN SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY IS PENDING**

Sharon Dzik asked how this policy change should be communicated to faculty so that they are aware what can be done in these cases.

Members made the following comments:

- Timing can be an issue so alerting a faculty member earlier regarding re-registration is best
- Faculty should be automatically notified when a student withdraws from class after the second week
- PeopleSoft could generate an email to the faculty
- Email should include information on this policy and who to contact for re-registration
- OSCAI should be the contact in this email
- Email should be available to all campuses covered by this policy but there is less need at Morris since when this amendment was approved by the campus assembly all faculty and students were made aware of the issue
- Only an F or N grade would trigger this policy
- When a student requests a withdrawal for non-academic reasons, there should be a check with OSCAI to make sure that a scholastic dishonesty report was not filed for one of the classes
- Education will be needed for more groups than just faculty, such as college personnel
- Undergraduate advisors are currently notified of withdrawals. If PeopleSoft cannot be modified, the advisors could be asked to email the faculty member.

Laura Coffin Koch said that she would check with Sue Van Voorhis about the change to PeopleSoft.

#### **4. AGENDA ITEMS FOR 2010-11**

Members mentioned the following agenda items:

- Finish meeting with professional schools and create a report
- Revise the graduate student reporting process
- Semester emails to faculty from DUGS
- Email to faculty when a student withdraws from a course
- Immutable 'F' – does it deter students from scholastic dishonesty or faculty from reporting

Q: Is there a policy on reporting scholastic dishonesty to advisors?

A: No but one could be developed.

#### **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

With no further business, Tom Shield thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert  
University Senate