

[In these minutes: Electronic Surveys, Clayton Report, Updates]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2002

10:00 – 11:30

238A MORRILL HALL

[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 view of, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Dorothy Anderson (Chair), Yev Garif, Betty Hackett, Laura Coffin Koch, Robert Pepin, David Roberts, Daniel Svedarsky, Carston Wagner.

REGRETS: Mark Bellcourt, Steve Brandt, Shawn Curley, Nicholas Velkov.

GUESTS: Kathy Skelton.

1. DISCUSSION OF ELECTRONIC SURVEYS

Betty Hackett said that she was working with Donald McCabe to help with a survey of the Twin Cities faculty, teaching assistants, and students on the subject of student academic integrity. The data from this campus could then be compared with other research he has done at other institutions.

For the survey, Mr. McCabe has provided a survey instrument, but Betty Hackett asked the committee if changes should be made and if additional questions should be asked. Once this committee has provided input, she will work with Institutional Research and Reporting before submitting the survey to the Institutional Review Board for final approval to conduct the survey.

Betty Hackett said that a letter would be sent to all participants explaining the rationale confidentiality, and introducing the survey. Who the letter comes from still needs to be determined. She has considered EVPP Bruininks and, for those people in the AHC, Dr. Cerra as well.

Committee members made the following comments:

- Survey is comprehensive
- Faculty Question 7 is too broad; other choices should be provided as to other remedies that students might try including that they were unsure of what to do

- Faculty Question 8 – if the answer is no, then faculty should be asked why; list of possible responses should be provided so faculty can check all that apply; include OSAI in the list
- Program areas in both surveys need to be changed to reflect the colleges on campus since each college will want to see its subset
- Faculty Demographic Question 1- not all ranks are included in this list; if the survey is conducted on the University's website, then an ID number can connect the demographic information and alleviate any problems
- Faculty Question 6 – report to a student board/council should be included in the choices
- Student survey will need to include specific behaviors and ask the students to respond truthfully to what they have done
- Should students be asked at the end how truthfully they answered the questions?
- Does the survey address why students do these behaviors?
- Student Question 6 – 'sure' should be removed and assignment should be added to the list
- Student Demographic Question 1 – professional student and students taking more than four years for their undergraduate degree need to be included on the list
- Survey should be administered to a random sample in early spring semester to avoid surveying freshmen without any University experience

Q: Will this survey be administered at the coordinate campuses as well?

A: Use of the survey was purchased for the Twin Cities only since results might vary by location. Each coordinate campus can decide to administer the survey also.

Q: What is the cost for this survey?

A: OSAI purchased the overall assessment and Mr. McCabe provides some discount since the University's data is added to his database for his research.

Betty Hackett then proposed adding four questions regarding an honor code and pledge on campus. Committee members made the following comments:

- Questions should ask about student academic integrity in a positive tone
- Students want faculty more involved in the reporting
- There is a difference among students in different colleges
- Students should be asked about signing a statement on blue books
- Students will not understand the difference between an honor code and an honor pledge in questions 3 and 4
- Responses should be used as a starting point for future actions
- Students should be asked what would reduce cheating
- Constant reminders make students feel that they are being accused of cheating while no reminders makes the behavior seem acceptable
- Students need to feel that faculty are involved in the process as well

2. CLAYTON REPORT

Laura Koch said that the committee should review the Clayton Report to see what progress the committee has made and what other issues still need to be resolved.

Dorothy Anderson said that the Clayton Report was used as the basis for the first few meetings last spring, at which time the committee determined that an honor pledge was not suitable at this time. Instead, the committee decided to work on awareness, laying the groundwork for a future pledge. The next issue would be to see how students feel, which will be accomplished once this survey is administered. Information on student academic integrity is being infused into other areas, such as orientation and admissions.

The committee then discussed issuing an interim report on the progress that it is making in terms of the Clayton Report and other areas that it is working on.

3. UPDATES

Betty Hackett gave the following updates:

- Next week she is meeting with undergraduate student affairs offices in the colleges to talk about central reporting
- Student Conduct Code is being reviewed to include unauthorized use of papers in two classes; discussions about code being applied to off-campus incidents
- Plagiarism workshop will be held at TA orientation
- Meeting with Residential Life to discuss fall programming
- Website is being updated
- 57 cases were reported in April compared to 432 total cases last year; more are expected in May
- More calls are being received on class disruptions

With no further business, Professor Anderson thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate