

**STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 9, 2015**

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

[In these minutes: Review of the work of the committee, OSCAI Updates, AIM Update, 2015-16 agenda items]

PRESENT: Ragui Assaad (Chair), Kimberly Clarke, Sharon Dzik, Kacey Gregerson, Rashne Jehangir, Susan LoRusso, Corrie Marion, LeAnn Snow, Carlos Torelli, Caitlin Wahouske.

REGRETS: Mark Bultmann, April Kim.

ABSENT: Stephen Gross.

GUESTS: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn.

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND REVIEW OF CHARGE

Introductions were made of all members present. Ragui Assaad 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 the biggest change since last spring is that two of her full-time staff members have left and she is in the process of re-hiring one position. She is hoping to redo the survey from several years ago that asked professional schools about how a charge of scholastic dishonesty affects applicants.

A member noted that at this year's New Faculty Orientation there was a round table for challenging issues and scholastic dishonesty was one of the topics. Many new faculty had questions but there was little direct information available

3. AIM PROGRAM UPDATE

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn said that OSCAI received 410 scholastic dishonesty cases last year. For first-time offenders her office developed AIM (Academic Integrity Matters) which is a restorative justice approach to scholastic dishonesty. If a student accepts responsibility and the sanction from the instructor, they can participate in the program. They attend a community meeting with faculty, staff, and students, and participate in a facilitated dialogue to address what happened, the impact, and what was learned. They are then given an additional sanction, which if they complete it, makes their charge non-disciplinary and not reportable on a background check.

Of the 197 cases filed in the spring, 33 students choose to participate in AIM through 10 community meetings. Of the 33 students, only two did not complete the additional sanction from the community meeting. The feedback on evaluations has been overwhelmingly positive. Students also report being better able to talk about their incident after the community meeting.

Going forward, OSCAI is looking to streamline the AIM program, increase the number of community participants and facilitators, and possibly create a set time for the meetings. A notice will be in Brief soon regarding the program, so they will see if reports increase.

Members made the following comments:

- Community meeting is not about students being ‘good’ or ‘bad’ which is the perception that student participants have
- Sanctioning guidelines address common and atypical scholastic dishonesty violations
- Most faculty know almost nothing about this topic unless they have to deal with it or serve on this committee
- This process should make faculty more willing to report

Q: What is the option for students who do not accept responsibility?

A: Their option is to request a hearing as AIM is not intended for those circumstances. If a student claims that they are not responsible, OSCAI will recommend that they go to a hearing.

Q: How many hearings are held each year?

A: For scholastic dishonesty, 3-12 a year

Q: What is the process for reporting a violation?

A: If an instructor suspects scholastic dishonesty, they should meet with the student to listen to what the student has to say. If the instructor still believes that scholastic dishonesty occurred, then they complete an online report. For first-time, domestic students, OSCAI sends a letter with the AIM option. For international students, OSCAI requires a meeting to discuss the incident. However, any student can ask for a meeting with OSCAI.

Q: Do multiple students participate in one community meeting?

A: Yes. 3-4 students is the best. All participants agree to share and keep details confidential. Only first names are used for the student participants.

Q: Has the OSCAI flowchart been revised to show AIM as an option?

A: Not yet as it was a pilot program last semester.

Q: Are graduate students eligible for AIM?

A: No.

4. REVIEW OF 2014-15 AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR 2015-16

Ragui Assaad reviewed the following topics that the committee undertook last year:

- Discussed academic integrity process and procedure from each system campus with representatives from each campus
- Discussed academic integrity data from new Twin Cities student survey
- Created “Advice from students to instructors on protecting academic integrity”

He then asked members for possible topics for this year. Members made the following suggestions:

- More education for students on academic integrity
- More education for faculty on reporting and talking about academic integrity

- Creating a video on academic integrity that faculty could use in classes
- Targeting more information towards introductory and freshmen courses
- Continuing to work on the AIM program
- Reviewing 2015 incoming student survey results

Members then discussed whether the University culture is ripe for an honor code. Sharon Dzik noted that they are most successful when student-driven and she is not sure if students at the University would support one. Conversations would need to be held with student leaders to gauge their interest. Pilot programs in one or two colleges might be a way to start.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, Ragui Assaad thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate