

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 30, 2000
1:30 – 2:30
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Sabeen Altaf, Muriel Bebeau, Linda Brady (also present as faculty representative for women's intercollegiate athletics), Susan Brorson, Meggan Ellingboe, Paul Enever, Joseph Massey, V. Rama Murthy, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Jason Reed, Charles Speaks, Billie Wahlstrom
- Regrets: David Hamilton, Paula Rabinowitz
- Absent: Amber Benning, Percy Chaby, Khaled Dajani, Les Drewes, Tim Dunn, Adam Lyche, Chris Shulstad
- Guests: Betty Hackett (Student Academic Integrity Office), Mark Bellcourt, Dorothy Anderson (members-designate, Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity); Jason Reed (Student Senate Consultative Committee); Professor Eugene Borgida (Advisory Committee on Athletics), Associate Vice Provost Laura Koch (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and Interim Director, Academic Counseling, Intercollegiate Athletics)
- Others: none

[In these minutes: new Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity and academic issues; discussion with chairs of the two athletic committees and the Interim Director of academic counseling for intercollegiate athletics]

1. Student Academic Integrity

Professor Morrison convened the meeting at 1:30, called for a round of introductions, and then welcomed to the governance system those new members of the Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity who had been able, on very short notice, to attend the meeting. He said that one purpose of the discussion was to talk about what the Committee would like to see over the next few months in the way of implementation of policies contained in the report from the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity (the Clayton Committee).

Everyone is familiar with what happened last year, Professor Morrison related, and the adoption of policy by the Senate. Implementation is a cooperative effort between the governance system and the Executive Vice President and Provost's office. Some things were settled by the Clayton Committee report; if there is to be change, there must be affirmative action taken to do so. One settled matter is that there will be a statement by students, although the form and frequency is to be decided by the new Senate

* 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.

committee; the Senate, however, EXPECTS a statement of some kind. He said he hoped it would be in place for the next academic year, at least for beginning students. His own view, he said, is that asking students to acknowledge the rules in every course and on every paper is foolish but it is up the committee to decide how to implement the policy.

Ms. Hackett, Professor Morrison said, will help faculty and students understand what is a permitted activity and what is not, what is and is not a violation of standards, and will help faculty devise exercises that make it more difficult for students to cheat.

The unfortunate part of the process is the disciplinary part, dealing with cases as they arise and dealing with the existing college structures in order to bring some sense to a disordered system. This part of the task includes establishing a central reporting system for allegations of student misconduct and ensuring that the college systems work. In the Law School, Professor Morrison reported, they have had an honor code for a long time and students must sign a statement; there have been cases. They settled on the principle that someone must be in charge of pursuing a case because the individual faculty member may not be inclined to or have the ability to confront a student or there may be intimidation because of a fear of being sued. That situation must be dealt with and intimidation not allowed.

Professor Morrison thanked the committee members for taking on the job and asked if anyone had comments.

Ms. Ellingboe inquired when students would be expected to sign a statement. Professor Morrison said the committee will have to look at that issue. This should not be thought of as an honor code but rather as an acknowledgement there are rules and that the student must abide by them. It may be that they will sign at registration but that is a logistical matter that the committee and the Office of the Registrar should decide.

What process will be followed to decide what is in the statement, Professor Massey asked? Ms. Hackett reported that she had attended a conference sponsored by the Center for Academic Integrity; the University was heralded for its report. She said she heard from everyone at the conference that the University should build a proper base and not go too fast and that it could take 3-5 years to have a system fully in place. But there is a ripeness now because of the athletic scandal that she said she would like to capitalize on.

Ms. Hackett said she had also met with LeeAnn Melin, Director of New Student Programs, and told her that the Faculty Consultative Committee wanted the academic integrity statement signature separate from the rest of the papers students must sign. She said she will speak to the Student Academic Integrity Committee about this as well. All colleges have been asked to speak about academic integrity in their orientation programs for new students. They tabulated 2300 responses from students about orientation; 96% said they understand academic integrity at the University; it was the highest-rated item on the survey. She is working with Ms. Melin about how orientation leaders can conduct discussions.

Of the three areas Professor Morrison mentioned, Professor Ratliff-Crain said, the education component is very important. The 96% of students who responded to the survey know they are not supposed to cheat but they encounter gray areas. Faculty and students both need help. There is an expert on moral development on this Committee, Ms. Hackett pointed out (Professor Bebeau); the question is

how to develop character so that one not only complies with the rules but is successful the rest of their life.

Mr. Bellcourt said he teaches a seminar and the questions he gets from students suggest that many students do not know what academic integrity at the University means; are they basing their response on what they did in high school or knowledge about what the University expects? Ms. Hackett said she wants to work with University officers and the committee to have online resources so students can find out any time of the night or day what they need to know. It is still the primary responsibility of faculty to talk about collaboration versus individual work, she said, and how to cite materials. There are websites available, Professor Brady commented, but she finds that students do not use them--because they say they don't need them. Even after talking about cheating in a class, two students still cheated.

Professor Wahlstrom agreed and pointed out that there is a search engine that looks up phrases. One way to convince people faculty take this seriously is to provide faculty the ability to discern plagiarism if they suspect it. The site she has used is free.

Mr. Enever said his concern is that while a modified honor code has value and is educationally important, the vast majority of students know what is wrong; some of those who know will cheat anyway. The problem is with faculty intimidated by students who cheat and the repeat offender: the University has no tracking mechanism so there is no consequence for the student. There must be consequences that are enforced, he said, so students will pay attention. He urged creating a mechanism to track allegations. Ms. Hackett said her office will create such a mechanism. Faculty and TAs must feel that they are not alone and that there is an office to help, she said. The University must be sure that faculty do not look the other way when they suspect cheating and there need to be incentives to report incidents so there are records and tracking. One of the problems in athletics was that students were likely given the benefit of the doubt; without tracking, it is not possible to identify someone playing the system.

There needs to be a communications component to her efforts, Professor Speaks said; many faculty do not know her office exists or what it can do. A newsletter will not be enough. She might ask the deans to join meetings with chairs to talk about the academic integrity office and what help faculty can expect. Ms. Hackett said right now her office is two people, herself and a student employee, but she has a posting for a new position who will handle the caseload while she handles communication. Anyone can take legal action against anyone, she noted, but no one has successfully sued a faculty member for reporting plagiarism. Faculty think these are tenacious cases; she had 83 cases settled last year where the student acknowledged wrongdoing.

Professor Speaks suggested providing faculty with brief language about problem cases, what is done, why academic cheating is investigated, and what is wrong. Most could find half an hour each semester to devote to the topic in the classes. Pick cases where it is not obvious what is wrong, he added.

Professor Brady wondered about the number of faculty who know what to do if they suspect cheating or what the options are. The new committee has a daunting task, Ms. Hackett observed. Before there was a central office the colleges should have had a process in place. The question is how to make the central process work.

There is only a tiny percentage of students who cheat, Mr. Bellcourt said. Ms. Hackett said her office was testament to how small the percentage is; what is needed is a mechanism to catch repeat

offenders. For the remaining students, it is a matter of providing education and assistance for those who are well-inclined. That is most students, she said.

Materials should be sent to every department head, Professor Wahlstrom said. As a department head, she found that faculty are afraid to do things because they are not sure what the University will do to back them up. Information must be available to faculty so they know they will be supported. She said she saw two cases where faculty were afraid to report cheating (although nothing happened when they did). Faculty must be told they should not be intimidated.

Not all examples of cheating are clear-cut, Professor Ratliff-Crain said. Ms. Hackett agreed and said that Professor Speaks was right to suggest that the case studies be ones where there is ambiguity.

Is there general agreement that in the formative years of her new office it should target new students, Ms. Hackett asked? They are easier to catch with unit education programs in big classes, Professor Morrison said. Enforcement, however, should apply to everyone. Students must acknowledge that the University is different from the high school environment and culture, Ms. Hackett said, and that they are moving to a new community of scholars. And if students have been here for a number of years, Professor Ratliff-Crain said, they will ask "why now?" Moreover, many will have heard so much about academic integrity they are sick of it, Ms. Ellingboe added.

That is a reason for more subtle intervention, Professor Bebeau said. She suggested presenting students with a cheating dilemma and ask them to develop reasons why they should or should not cheat. Some will argue that a student should cheat (e.g., if the professor is an ogre). That kind of intervention provides an opportunity for students to think about all the pros and cons and consequences and helps them think about their own actions and what happens if people think of them as a cheater. One can raise consciousness about their responsibilities if they see others cheating. Since she has done that with students she has had very few incidents of cheating; before that, there were a lot more. This kind of approach could work with more advanced students and it raises the question about various approaches that can be taken. Students must be aware of the sanctions, what cheating is, and have the opportunity to reflect on what it means.

Mr. Reed asked how a student's privacy is protected. If a student makes a mistake, he or she isn't going to want the incident broadcast. Ms. Hackett said her office will look to reports from faculty when a penalty is assigned. Any record is only released on a need-to-know basis or if the student authorizes its release. There is a question about privacy from which she will need guidance from the General Counsel's office, Ms. Hackett added: when using search engines, is it a violation of student's privacy? She also said that repeated offenses would lead to an increased sanction. Do students have access to files, Dr. Koch asked? They do and can add statements.

Professor Anderson commented that if a student is guilty but learned a lesson, he or she would not want the incident broadcast--and if not, the student would CERTAINLY not want it broadcast. In her college there is a scholastic committee and a student board so a student would have the opportunity to explain what happened. The student would not want to be accused of cheating, depending on what happened. Professor Bebeau said the problem is always labeling something, which calls for judgment; it is better simply to DESCRIBE the behavior.

Professor Morrison thanked Ms. Hackett, Professor Anderson, and Mr. Bellcourt for joining the meeting and said that the Committee would like to have a report at the end of Spring Semester on the work of the new committee.

2. Discussion with Athletic Committee Chairs

During the preceding discussion Professors Borgida and Evans and Associate Vice Provost Koch had joined the meeting; Professor Morrison now welcomed them.

Professor Borgida, chair of the Advisory Committee on Athletics, began by saying that his committee is on a quest for its identity and he recapped its activities thus far. It has had meetings with Professor Evans (chair of the Faculty Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, hereinafter FAOCIA), the two new faculty representatives to the Big Ten and the NCAA, and also planning meetings, including an all-day retreat of both athletic committees. They have received briefings from every part of the University that deals with athletics so that everyone on the committee is "on the same page." They have talked openly about the issues that are on peoples' minds as a result of the athletic scandal so much has been put on the table. He and Professor Evans have also met with the coaching staffs and with the two athletic directors.

At the first meeting of the committee, at the end of October, they reviewed the Board of Regents' policy on athletics and made recommendations for changes in it; those have been forwarded to FAOCIA and will be sent to the drafting committee (of the Senate) by the end of the year.

There is much concern about "enhancing community," Professor Borgida said, which takes in the issue of student welfare. There is a high level of distrust and tension on both sides; many in the academic community have pulled back from athletics and the athletic people feel as though they are under siege. The committee felt it must try to break that down and talk about the issues so it has decided to meet with the coaches. The committee felt it was appropriate to meet with them directly to get more information; if they are to address policy issues, it would be irresponsible of the committee to do so without meeting with the coaches. The FAOCIA has a different view on this issue. As a result, the committee met with both groups of coaches without the respective athletic director present to increase the probability that the coaches would be more forthcoming.

The women's coaches were concerned about the stigma attached to student-athletes in the aftermath of the scandal; the athletes will not wear athletic jackets because they do not want to be singled out. That has caused anguish; one way to enhance community is to bring faculty and athletic people together. The men's coaches raised issues about academic counseling and monitoring student performance.

The committee has also discussed the recent proposal from the NCAA regarding amateurism (deregulating it) and made recommendations to the President after hearing from the academic counselors and the coaches. It will also meet with Vice President Tonya Brown to discuss operating efficiencies that might be achieved between men's and women's athletics, gender equity, and a new coaches' bonus plan. In January it will meet with the academic counselors and also hear about the sports precinct physical planning, receive a budget overview, and consider issues of diversity.

The issues that have emerged from the meetings include the following. First, in terms of the identification of the two new athletic committees, it is clear the chairs must address the coaches' perceptions of the committees and clarify what they are. Both he and Professor Evans heard a lot about perceptions of the new structure (i.e., that two committees will be less efficient than one, that if the committees cannot deal with specific problems, what good are they, that this is more of the "same old, same old, and that if the athletic and academic people are in the same community the committees should help the athletic people). This perception needs to be addressed in the near future; he and Professor Evans will send a memo clarifying the charge to the two committees and make it clear that neither "has a 1-800 number." The coaches may misunderstand what the committees are about; they are policy groups that do not deal with individual situations, most of which can be handled within the existing mechanisms. He said the committees will talk with the faculty representatives and with Dr. Koch to dispel the belief that the committees exist to provide relief for specific problems.

A second issue involves enhancing community. There must be work with the faculty representatives and athletic directors to deal with the suspicion and lack of trust that exists. Professor Borgida said the committee was saddened by the stigmatization of student-athletes and said they must work to find common ground and to develop a sense that everyone is in this together. The committee will develop recommendations to address the issue. The committee believes academic-athletics matters should be discussed at various orientation sessions, including with new Twin Cities deans, and with new department chairs, and at the new faculty orientations held by colleges at the beginning of the academic year, so that everyone would then be on the same page; the discussions should include explanation of how the committee functions and how faculty should interact with athletics and what the relationship between faculty and athletic academic counseling should be.

Both of the new committees have had good experiences, Professor Borgida concluded, and the athletic directors support the new structure. He also said he was very pleased at how involved the members of the committee have been. He also extended a warm compliment to Vickie Courtney, of the Senate office, without whom the committees could not do their work.

Professor Evans next echoed Professor Borgida in noting that the committees together and separately have been trying to identify their charges and how to implement them; she said they do not want to replicate what existed before but they also need to learn from what happened before. FAOCIA has very specific charges, she said; it deals not with general policy but with academic policies that must be consulted on. More specifically, for example, it must certify travel schedules, review guidelines on student eligibility, and examine whether graduation rates and grade-point averages are acceptable; the committee is trying to identify how to do what it is responsible for doing. (The committee has approved the fall team schedules, very late, and is taking steps to be sure it approves them in a more timely way in the future. The committee has concluded that it need not look at every transcript or screen for eligibility to participate in athletics; there are experts who do that and who also, within the colleges, certify a student's progress to a degree.)

The committee is composed of wonderful people, Professor Evans declared, and credibility is very important to it. The athletic directors seem to understand that the committee is important and that it must be credible and also to understand that the faculty as a whole has a stake in doing things right.

It was important to put on the table at the retreat and to make clear that they share a commitment to the STUDENT-athletes and their education. It must be recognized that there may be a conflict in

priorities in specific cases--one must be open about that--but it must also be transparent what the rules are and how they will be enforced; the committee does not want to deal with a lot of exceptions (there should only be a few, Professor Evans said). There is no doubt that all large universities give coaches a mixed message; they are hired and fired on winning, period, but the top priority of the institution is education. It is not difficult to understand why there are conflicts in priorities.

FAOCIA will not conduct academic reviews of the teams in the same way they were done in the past; they were well-intentioned but did not get anywhere. They are working on routinizing timely review of travel schedules and working with Dr. Koch and Mr. Blanchard to develop data presentations on each team (grades, progress to degree, and records over time and of cohorts, and so on). All these data exist; the point is to have the data flag problems or emerging problems and then to meet with the athletic directors about them.

Professor Wahlstrom asked if it would be possible to graph data on grades and progress to degree along with won-lost records in order to tell the coaches they can win with good students. Professor Evans was not sure that would be useful because many teams have grade-point levels well above the average for the student body. But it might be possible, Professor Wahlstrom responded, to say that "bad" students academically do not produce winning teams. Professor Evans asked Dr. Koch if she could look into this question.

It may not be realistic to expect an improvement in team grades every year, Professor Evans said. They do not want a student's education to suffer and they do not want the University to USE great athletes but not let it be possible for them to succeed academically. They are, in any event, creating a data system to help them flag problems and they will meet regularly with the Director of Admissions.

FAOCIA has been negotiating with the Advisory Committee on Athletics about the role of each committee; it is becoming clearer that FAOCIA is more judicial and that as a rule it is NOT appropriate for the Committee as a whole to meet with the coaching staffs. They will gather data, flag problems, and inform the athletic directors--and hold them accountable. They will review a team if asked.

Her committee reports to Vice Provost Craig Swan in the Executive Vice President and Provost's office, Professor Evans related, while Professor Borgida's committee reports to Vice President Brown. The committee has done an incredible amount of work and takes its job very seriously. She added that she has a new appreciation for the academic counseling service and expressed appreciation to Dr. Koch for stepping in as the Interim Director of the program. She never understood its work before and she said she was sure many faculty do not.

Professor Morrison turned now to Professor Brady.

Professor Brady said that there was much discussion, following the meetings with the coaches, about whether this Committee should take another look at the "no contact" (between coaches and faculty) rule. Professor Evans, she said, believes the issue should not be re-opened, and she herself does not have strong feelings, but the issue came up in discussion of a number of student welfare issues brought up by coaches. One concern expressed by students is that the study hall is more social than study; the assertion was not contradicted by those who know about it.

One question is whether existing mechanisms are adequate to handle matters, Professor Borgida said, or if it needs to be made clearer who must go where for what. Rather than stir up issues, he asked Dr. Koch to tell the Advisory Committee on Athletics about the mechanisms that exist. The study hall issue is one that the committee should not handle; the faculty representatives should deal with it.

The other question is whether "no contact" means "no contact," Professor Brady said. One charge made is that faculty talk a lot but don't do anything; she said she would like to go back to the coaches and tell them what the rule means. She said she needs to be trusted because she has over two years left in the position of faculty representative. Professor Evans said FAOCIA takes the strong position that no contact means no contact; the committee does not want to revisit the matter. Later in the meeting Professor Evans issued a clarification on the question of contact. "No contact" means no contact about the progress of individual students. It is NOT a statement that coaches and faculty cannot interact. To the contrary, FAOCIA believes there should probably be more such interaction. But with respect to coach-faculty contact about individual students, there are too many ways things can go wrong or be misconstrued.

A number of the issues raised by coaches can be dealt with by the mechanisms that are in place, Professor Borgida said; the coaches simply need to know about them. "No contact" is unambiguous and easy to interpret, Professor Speaks said; once one backs away from that language it is not and one will spend a lot of time interpreting.

Professor Morrison said that a well-meaning coach can approach faculty member--and the immediate reaction of the faculty is to call the local newspapers to report that a coach is trying to interfere with the academic process. For their own self-defense coaches need to be very cautious about contacting faculty. He then turned to Dr. Koch for comments.

Dr. Koch noted that she had just started as interim director of academic counseling and pointed out that Academic Counseling and Student Services is not a part of athletics but reports to the Executive Vice President and Provost's office. She said, responding to the preceding discussion, that there is a mechanism in place by which coaches can get information about the academic progress of a student-athlete. There are forms that are sent to faculty, although the response rate is poor, which is a concern to counselors and coaches.

Academic Counseling has been in flux the last 18-20 months--the long-time director retired, there was an interim director, then a new director who subsequently resigned, and now she is interim director. Coaches may be confused about the role of the program but there are counselors who work with each team and provide information; the coaches can ask them for information but don't know what to do if they do not receive what they need quickly enough. She is developing a format for them to use in getting information they need.

At the same time, Dr. Koch said, one must be careful in defining what one means when talking about academic progress. Some coaches would like weekly or biweekly reports on every student, which is clearly not possible for a class with 150 students. Coaches must be helped to understand what it is reasonable for them to expect.

There is a program for high-risk students who are identified by the coaches; at present it has about 75 students in it, primarily first-year students. That number could increase, if coaches are concerned about more students, but Academic Counseling would need additional funding to handle any

increase. In addition, a counselor can provide more reports on any student but at the same time there should be trust between the coach and the student--the coach can ask the student about his or her academic progress. There are a lot of ways for a coach to get information without going to the faculty, she said.

As a former member of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Dr. Koch said, she is concerned about contact with faculty. Coaches can be intimidating (even if they do not intend to be so), especially for instructors who are not tenured. Direct contact does create problems.

Professor Brady asked if it would be possible to send a message to the coaches that would address the problem they brought up so they can have an answer. Her concern, she said, is that faculty are not viewed as responsive to concerns the coaches raise. Professor Morrison suggested that Dr. Koch and the two faculty representatives send such a message to the coaches. Dr. Koch agreed to take the lead.

Dr. Koch then commented on the problem identified by Professor Borgida, that student-athletes are singled out because they are athletes and that comments are made by faculty about them. They also encounter faculty who want to give special treatment to student-athletes. What they want is that student-athletes are treated like all other students. They are working on a brochure for faculty on what is fair and what is unfair; she said she hoped that faculty, if they have a question, will go to the director of Academic Counseling or to the faculty representatives for straight answers. She said she suspected many faculty do not know who to call about what they can do. (One big issue is make-up exams when student-athletes miss one because of competition; some faculty will not allow them.)

In terms of data, Academic Counseling has prepared many reports for both the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy about the academic programs in athletics. With the new structure they are now trying to generate reports with trends, course-taking patterns, GPAs, data on recruited and non-recruited athletes, and so on. She also said, in response to a question, that there is no distinction in academic counseling between recruited and non-recruited or revenue-sport versus non-revenue sport athletes.

Professor Morrison again said that a meeting in May will be scheduled to follow up on the discussion today in order to talk with FAOCIA, the Advisory Committee on Athletics, and Dr. Koch. A big issue will be financial matters: are there subsidies or cross-subsidies? The Committee has also been informed about the stadium discussion; the question of joint services between the two departments has also been raised. Professor Speaks reported that the Finance and Planning Committee will take up the stadium issue, although Vice President Brown has said it is premature to do so now. That may be, Professor Morrison commented, but Professor Speaks's committee needs to be sure the decision is not made before the discussion takes place; things have a way of jumping ahead, and he encouraged the Finance and Planning Committee to look at the numbers.

Professor Borgida said the spirit of the discussion at the advisory committee was to look at the procedures and how they might be tweaked. The coaches want to hear back; they have followed up on the request; he asked that Dr. Koch's memo also be circulated to the advisory committee. The coaches will be even more alienated if they are not informed of what was decided.

There was discussion about building community. Professor Morrison asked what could be done to increase the sense of community. Over the last ten years, he said, the entire University has fragmented

into departments and colleges and intercollegiate athletics had among the weakest connections to the academic community to start with. If one thinks about this from the coach's perspective, Professor Bebeau observed, they do a lot for the individual competitors and they know the influence of academics on the life of the student so they want to influence the academic side as well. Coaches have more influence on student-athletes than anyone else, Professor Evans said; if a coach wants students to go to class, they will, because coaches are powerful role models. That is one reason FAOCIA looks at GPAs and academic progress by team.

If one could get faculty and coaches in a conversation about how to promote the development of students, Professor Bebeau said, and a discussion of the joint responsibilities of faculty and coaches, that would help to build relationships. Almost all the coaches care deeply about how students do in the classroom, Dr. Koch agreed. One only wishes, Professor Speaks mused, that the University could have committees similar to those chaired by Professors Borgida and Evans to look out for the interests of non-athletes.

It is clear, Professor Evans repeated, that sometimes the University sends mixed messages to coaches. The committees are here to define a set of values; the coaches espouse those same values but sometimes they want urgent decisions. They must know that the values and institution cannot be rearranged to respond to those requests; sometimes they must realize there will be annoyances.

Professor Morrison thanked Professors Borgida and Evans and Dr. Koch for joining the meeting.

Before adjourning, Professor Morrison called on Professor Massey, who said he simply wished it made part of the record that Senior Vice President Cerra, in his State of the Academic Health Center address, had singled out Professor Bebeau for special recognition for her service.

Professor Morrison then adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota