

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 19, 2000
11:30 – 2:00
Room 471 Law**

- Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Linda Brady, Susan Brorson, Dan Feeney, Richard Goldstein, Marti Hope Gonzales, David Hamilton, Joseph Massey, Marvin Marshak, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Charles Speaks
- Regrets: Muriel Bebeau, Les Drewes, Paula Rabinowitz, Billie Wahlstrom
- Absent: V. Rama Murthy
- Guests: Betty Hackett (Academic Integrity Office); President Mark Yudof; Professor Richard McGehee (Health Plan Task Force)
- Other: Elizabeth Wroblewski (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: Student academic integrity; political matters; director of research compliance; various matters with the President; health care]

1. Student Academic Integrity

Professor Morrison convened the meeting at 11:40 and welcomed Betty Hackett, the newly-named Student Academic Integrity Officer for the Twin Cities campus.

The new title and position is in addition to being Student Judicial Officer, Ms. Hackett explained to the Committee; her academic integrity title is only for the Twin Cities campus while the advisory committee that is being appointed, the Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity, is system-wide. Are there academic integrity officers on the other campuses, Professor Morrison asked? Ms. Hackett said she did not know.

Ms. Hackett recalled that she had been on the Clayton Committee and then related that she had come into her field because of her appreciation of the work of Dean E. G. Williamson, who believed that student conduct should be addressed with education and generosity. She has served as Student Judicial Officer for about 10 years and has been involved with the MISbehavior end of student behavior; she said it will be rewarding to serve the academic community in a more positive way through the activities of her new position. It may be odd to see academic integrity as a new initiative when everyone at the table has devoted their careers to academic integrity; she said she would like to bring about more acknowledgement about academic integrity and bring faculty and staff values closer to student life and make those values more meaningful for students.

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

Ms. Hackett said one needs a common-sense approach that allows faculty to pursue suspicions and, if they are unable to resolve them, to provide a central process and central information flow. The latter is particularly necessary to identify repeat offenders.

She is not bringing a blueprint of the office or its activities, Ms. Hackett said; she is too new to the job. But she does have a vision, which grew out of the work of the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity (the Clayton Committee), and is looking forward to working with the new Senate advisory committee. She said she believed she was given the new job because of the care she has brought to misconduct matters in the past; she wants to try to do the job right the first time. With an expanded office, she will try to keep faculty and students out of trouble and deal with mishaps. Some students are dishonest, she commented; others are unschooled. The Internet brings promise as well as temptation and is an area that requires work. She brings to the job optimism, caution, and a determination to do it right.

There are two areas that have been talked about, Professor Morrison related: prevention and dealing with incidents after the fact. In terms of prevention, there was discussion of a declaration for students to sign; does she have any sense where that will occur?

Ms. Hackett responded that there was not a consensus on the Clayton Committee about an honor code but that there appears to be great satisfaction in the professional schools that have them. She will have to investigate whether a modified honor code would work and how students would like to approach this issue. There was talk about a speech code at one time; the University wisely navigated its way around that problem and found other ways to deal with problems. Would a honor code achieve what the University wants? Students seem receptive and it does promote the ideals of higher education.

There was a recommendation from the Clayton Committee that students sign an affirmation about academic integrity, Professor Morrison pointed out, and there will be many who are very disappointed if that recommendation is not implemented this year. The only question is whether students should sign once on admission to the University, once per semester, or on every exam. Few believe students should sign the affirmation on every exam, but the Clayton Committee was endorsed by the Senate in principle and it is necessary to get the statement adopted and signed and to not let it fall by the wayside.

Professor Speaks said he did not believe a single signature at admissions or a signature on every exam was wise. Because the University has a low graduation rate, with students who drop in and out, they should sign the statement more than once. One possibility would be a hand-signed document at admission and an acknowledgement at every registration (although clicking on a web site may not be personal enough to make the statement real). However done, Professor Gonzales urged, it should be a stand-alone statement, not just another piece of paper that students have to sign.

There was an effort to promote and integrate academic integrity in orientation this fall, Ms. Hackett noted, both in the general orientation to the University as well as in the college sessions. She said she wants to find out what effect that effort had. Was it transitory? Much of academic integrity is simply education and it must not get lost in a storm of other things.

Students are like faculty in at least one respect, Professor Hamilton maintained. Faculty will sign a declaration that they have read the Code of Conduct, the Consultation Policy, the Conflict of Interest Policy, without ever having read them. They must sign such statements every year when they submit

forms. The signature attests that they have read the policies and will abide by them. He related that he has been involved in the education program on the responsible conduct of research and spoken with perhaps 1200 faculty over six months; in any group of 50 faculty, it would be unusual to get more than 3 or 4 who have actually read the policies. Everyone at the University received the Code of Conduct with their September 20 paycheck; when he asked people if they remembered receiving it, few did, he said. It was a green sheet; most people appear to have discarded it.

To mitigate the University's risk in these matters it must have the faculty and staff sign; if they sign and are then caught in fraudulent activities, it is their problem. Professor Hamilton said the anecdote was only intended to be cautionary: requiring people to sign something will not necessarily get the results one hopes for.

That means there must be multiple approaches to instill the meaning, Ms. Hackett agreed. Perhaps there should be bookmarks with the affirmation printed on it given out with every book purchased. Professor Morrison agreed that there must be a wide variety of methods to reach students but the fact that signing a statement is not singularly and totally effective does NOT mean students should not sign it. Such a statement has symbolic value. Professor Hamilton agreed that a variety of approaches should be used.

There has been a suggestion that syllabi have information about academic integrity, Professor Ratliff-Crain commented and that the topic should be brought up in classes. A number of things have been going on since the basketball scandal and people ARE more aware of the issue. Faculty do now talk more about academic integrity in their classes; that is a place students can be reminded and FACULTY should be reminded of that fact.

Ms. Hackett agreed emphatically. She also reported that students cheat more in courses outside their major or in courses they do not want to take than they do in major courses; anything faculty can do to reinforce the message is helpful. They can also define cheating, Professor Ratliff-Crain added; many students do not see certain things as cheating.

Professor Speaks agreed that students should sign a statement but added that the Committee should not kid itself that doing so is a preventive measure. He said he could not imagine anything more important to talk about with students than academic integrity but said that there is no place it fits in the curriculum. Where does one inject the "thou shalt not" lessons? Professor Brorson agreed and suggested that the freshman seminars would be a good place. She said she also sets aside one day in her introductory course to talk about academic integrity, how to cite materials, and so on, so the message is repeated. Students should get it in several places; everyone needs reminders.

In the professional master's program in his field, Professor Speaks related, they are required by their accrediting agency to show ethical practices--but that is too late. Professor Hamilton pointed out that there is an effort to incorporate ethics in the curriculum by the Graduate School but the principles could be applied at other levels. There is also a web site with a great deal of helpful information: www.research.umn.edu/ethics.

If one looks at earlier events at the University, Professor Feeney said, the policy on sexual harassment could be a model, which called for training for faculty and students. He recalled that the training helped because the explanations helped people understand the meaning of the policy. There

should be an oral training session; students in his college are given a talk about academic integrity and reminded periodically about it.

Any effort to bring academic life to the forefront of students' minds would be beneficial, Ms. Hackett said, because it is not done now. That is a problem because universities are evolving into training institutes, not places that provide an education, Professor Hamilton commented. Ms. Hackett said when she talks to students charged with an offense about academic life, many are surprised that anyone would talk about the university as place that is not just a mall but rather is an academic community.

In terms of dealing with incidents after the fact, Professor Morrison then said, one major concern is that there be created investigative resources so a faculty member who suspects cheating need not assume a large burden of the work but can pass it to people who can. Has she thought about that, he asked?

There will be disciplinary/field-of-inquiry expertise that her office will not have, Ms. Hackett said, but there will be general tools that they can use. Faculty members can always talk to students and confront them with a question; if there is need to go to a more formal mechanism, faculty members can refer the matter to her office.

But she will set up an investigative function? The most frequent comment from the faculty is that if they have to pursue a charge, it will take 40 - 80 hours away from intellectual work; is it worth it or should they let it pass? His answer, Professor Morrison said, is that if a faculty member can spend 30 minutes and send the issue to someone else to assume the burden, that is something faculty will do. That will also be more efficient, he added.

There is a myth, however, that cases cannot satisfactorily be resolved at the local level, Ms. Hackett pointed out, which is not true. In most instances students, when confronted, will acknowledge they did something wrong and it is worked out at the unit level with an appropriate penalty.

At what stage is an alleged violation reported to her office, Professor Speaks asked? When to the college or department? At present, if the incident is within a college, it is reported to the college, Ms. Hackett said. Regents' policy provides that a student may have one formal hearing and one campus-wide appeal. In the case of cross-college incidents, her office is now the next level of resolution and provides the hearing. She will try to centralize this system and try for consistency of application of the rules. She said that she will continue to rely on faculty members and P&A staff to serve on the hearing panels.

Professor Morrison said there were two loci of focus with respect to a code: (1) for general undergraduate and graduate education where there is no specific honor code and (2) those few colleges that have effective honor code systems and the coordinate campuses. Will all be moved, all but those with effective honor codes and the coordinate campuses, or will things stay as they are at present? There should be a consistency for all the undergraduate colleges on the Twin Cities campus, he suggested.

Professor Ratliff-Crain reported that Morris is setting up an academic integrity subcommittee and said he was under the impression that Ms. Hackett's office would provide advice and investigative expertise to the other campuses. Is she working that out? Ms. Hackett said she is and will always be available as a resource. Her office has expertise because it has seen a lot of cases in addition to content

expertise, she added. Professor Brorson related how incidents are handled at the Crookston campus and said that improvements were needed.

Professor Brorson went on to say that she hoped that support would be provided for all campuses and that something would be done for faculty so they know what students sign and can be educated about the kinds of cases that come up across units. She said would like to see faculty included in the process so they can be informed, can inform students, will know the process--and because some faculty are not sure what is dishonest.

Professor Morrison said that for the coordinate campuses and units that have honor codes there must be monitoring to be sure that the systems are really working--and if they are not, they must be taken over by the central office. Ms. Hackett responded that bad administration of an honor code is worse than no honor code so she wants to be sure the system works.

In the Law School, Professor Morrison told the Committee, there is a joint faculty-student process; the individual faculty member is not responsible for pursuing an allegation but simply turns the materials over to another faculty member. This second faculty member prepares the file and files the complaint, which then goes to a hearing. Most cases are not tried; they are settled between the investigator and the individual. If they go to a hearing, there is a professional and documented result so that there is a record if they are sued. He said he thinks this is necessary. But students do make mistakes, he said. One Committee member had mentioned a paper in which "Internet" was the citation; that, Professor Morrison commented, is not dishonesty, it is stupidity: "a damn bad job of footnoting." Ms. Hackett concurred and added that she would not want to punish ignorance.

Professor Morrison announced that the Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity is being appointed but the process will take 4 - 6 weeks; he suggested that in the interim the Senate Consultative Committee serve as the advisory committee. Committee members approved the suggestion without dissent; Professor Morrison said he would contact the students about SCC serving in this capacity.

Professor Morrison thanked Ms. Hackett for coming to the meeting and said there would be a Senate Consultative Committee meeting with her in the near future.

2. Discussion with Professor Marshak

Professor Morrison next asked Professor Marshak for a report on issues related to the budget and the legislature.

Professor Marshak reported that the biennial request had been approved by the Board of Regents, including \$58.1 million for increased health care costs on the current budget. The Governor has established a "challenge pool" but it is unclear if the University will contribute to it. There will be a new revenue forecast after Thanksgiving; it is expected there will be an additional surplus but it will be relatively small due to various factors. The Governor expects a 3% increase in the state budget but the increased cost of health care for the University, MnSCU, and state agencies will be more than 3%. There is a possibility the University "will get clobbered."

The Committee discussed with Professor Marshak various political matters, campaigns, and possible faculty activities with respect to the biennial request. Professor Marshak pointed out at the

conclusion that the University "needs more money than it has ever gotten before to stay even and if it does not get that much it will not stay even."

3. Director of Research Compliance

Professor Hamilton distributed copies of the position description for the Director of Research Compliance. He explained that the Senate Research Committee had heard a presentation from Vice President Maziar about it and had discussed it for some while; it had then voted in favor of the description after recommending a few changes (which have been incorporated in the language). There is a provision that the Director would report annually to the Senate Research Committee; the intent is that the individual be tied into the governance system.

Action by FCC is needed so the position can be sent to the President for his approval.

Professor Morrison moved that the position description be sent to the President; the motion was approved without dissent.

4. Discussion with President Yudof

Professor Morrison turned next to the President to talk about issues he wished to bring to the Committee. A number of topics were covered.

-- The search for a new men's athletic director is coming to an end and it should be satisfactory to the faculty and all University constituent groups. Football coach Glen Mason has made a very positive contribution to the search.

-- The remodeling of Coffman will be brought to the Committee. With the present construction market, it is likely the University will need to redo every project in the six-year capital plan. Both this and other committees have pointed out the limits to University debt capacity; increased construction costs will inevitably lead to a shorter capital construction list.

-- Consultation with the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning will be smoothed out; the Committee discussed the position of the President vis-à-vis SCFP and the perception by SCFP that it does not see materials or hear about issues until they are a fait accompli. The President said this will be fixed. Professor Feeney commented that there is a difference between consultation and being the first to know and speculated that mid-level administrators are reluctant to take matters to a committee before an administrative decision has been made. Others suggested that the capital planning process is among the worst examples, and particularly capital projects that are self-funded. In the case of the latter, Professor Marshak observed that these projects take land so that parking needs to build more ramps and contended that these especially need faculty consultation.

The President urged that Finance and Planning review the capital plan and provide him advice; the President emphasized that he does NOT have a problem with the Committee reviewing materials and offering counsel before a decision has been made.

5. Health Plan Task Force

Professor Morrison turned to Professor McGehee for a report from the Health Plan Task Force.

Professor McGehee said that not a great deal had changed since his last report. There have been three additional meetings with the state. The Department of Employee Relations (DOER) expects budgets to increase by 3% while health care budgets will increase by 15%. They want to hold the budgeted increase to 5%, which means that 10% of the health care cost will be shifted to employees. The unions, however, have signalled that they will not accept that plan ("over our dead bodies"). But employers are looking for ways to save money in health care, Professor McGehee said.

Professor McGehee reviewed many of the same issues that the Committee had discussed with him at earlier meetings, including what the relationship of the University would be to the state if the University elected not to separate from the state health plan. One possible barrier to changes in the University's relationship with DOER is that almost all health plan changes will probably need to be approved by the legislature. DOER is, however, very willing to work with the University.

The President, Professor McGehee, and the Committee discussed timelines as well as the advantages and disadvantages to staying with the state plan. Professor Morrison said the issue arises every two years; this is a better position than the University has been in before but the timeline hits bad times. At some point the University may need to bite the bullet and take the possible political flak during the biennium and then get beyond the issue. Up to now the administration has always been able to blame DOER if health care quality went down and costs went up; that would not be the case if the University separated. DOER also gives the University a \$58 million problem, he added.

The Committee and President also discussed what would happen to benefits at the University vis-à-vis what the unions would obtain or retain and the potential difficulties if those levels of benefits were different. The unions have made it clear they will fight very hard on this issue, Professor McGehee said.

This is a problem bigger than the University, Professor Brorson commented; is anyone in society willing to tackle it? Professor Marshak pointed out that the United States spends about 14% of GDP on health care; Europe spends about 7%. Part of the lower level is due to rationing of health care; part is that they have single-payer systems.

Professor Goldstein inquired about the numbers being used in the biennial request; after some discussion, it was agreed that there should be clarification of how the numbers have been derived.

Professor Morrison adjourned the meeting at 2:00.

-- Gary Engstrand