

[In these minutes: OSAI Updates, Faculty and Student Surveys]

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

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 2003**

**9:30 – 11:00 AM**

**300 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), Mark Bellcourt, Shawn Curley, Betty Hackett, Laura Coffin Koch, Dan Oberg, Robert Pepin, David Roberts, Daniel Svedarsky.

**REGRETS:** Mickey Trent.

**ABSENT:** Melissa Hagel, Abu Jalal, Elizabeth McCann, Carston Wagner.

**GUESTS:** Kathy Skelton.

### **1. OSAI UPDATES**

Betty Hackett said that she has been unable to do much general outreach this year due to the increased caseload, but has addressed some special concerns and needs including:

- CCE Student Affairs – helping with information for PSEO students, College in Schools students, and older students
- LASK Instruction – information for half-semester classes on scholastic skills, collaboration, and plagiarism
- CEHD – discussing cheating violations in regards to licensure, records retention and release, and fitness of character reports
- Psychology – helping instructional staff with information for research courses and citation of materials
- Natural Resources – reviewed changes to the honor code
- Student Affairs in undergraduate colleges – met to discuss issues on centralization of academic integrity

She also said that the revised language for the Student Conduct Code has been presented to the Regents for information and will be voted on in June. The new language includes revised language on scholastic dishonesty and a new section dealing with classroom misconduct.

Lastly, reporting of incidents has continued to rise. For the first six months that the Office was in existence, 15 cases were reported. In the same six month time frame this year (July-December) 100 cases were reported, with another 30 since December. OSAI is also having more students call as tipsters and is now seeing more repeat offenders. The University's efforts were recently publicized on a Channel 9 news story and a University student is writing a paper on the topic.

Q: Were the violations in CEHD contained in certain areas or courses?

A: The violations occurred in several different areas, but there was some concentration with students just returning for their licensure.

Betty Hackett then said that her office was tipped-off to a cheating ring within an IT department by students. Some students resented others for receiving grades that they had not earned. Once this information came forward, IT did its own investigation.

Q: Was this situation handled well?

A: Yes, IT did a good job within the college and department.

Q: What is the status of the Natural Resources Honor Code revisions?

A: It has been ratified by the students and new copies can be sent to committee members.

Q: Has reporting increased within the college?

A: With the review, more students were talking about the honor code, which lead to more reporting.

Kathy Skelton from Duluth said that proposed policy guidelines and a reporting form have been forwarded to the Duluth Educational Policy Committee for review. Both should be approved this spring.

## **2. DISCUSSION OF FACULTY AND STUDENT SURVEYS ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Dorothy Anderson said that a subcommittee reviewed the surveys from Donald McCabe and came up with proposed changes. The subcommittee would like the full committee's approval today. The changed surveys will then be presented to Donald McCabe for his approval. The timeline would then be to administer the survey in November 2003.

Committee members then turned to the two survey instruments and made the following general comments in addition to specific wording changes:

- There is a difference between a neutral response and someone not agreeing or disagreeing with the question
- Survey can be a gauge for students and faculty wanting a campus honor code

- Difference between monitoring and upholding academic integrity
- Survey questions may give students new information that they did not think about before
- Average student might not complete survey because of the length
- Students might answer quickly and not think about the answers
- Faculty could be asked to take class time to complete the survey, especially on a smaller campus
- This survey will be used for comparison, but the University will develop its own instrument for future use
- Correlation of GPA and response would be useful
- Response rate might not be tied to GPA but to dedicated students and complainers
- Only first question should be shown for the TA survey, with the others appearing if the answer is yes
- University should receive raw data so it can do other analyses

Q: How will students be sampled?

A: A random stratified approach will be used so that students from each college are selected to participate.

Q: Can demographic questions be removed?

A: No since the survey is anonymous and that is the only way to tell who has answered it.

Q: When and how will the survey be presented?

A: The survey will be on-line, with an email sent asking participants to complete it. The timeframe will be the first three weeks of November, with reminders sent, but no incentives offered because of the anonymity. The subcommittee was concerned about the return rate, but Donald McCabe has done this many times without any problems.

Q: Can the survey be truly anonymous?

A: Some people might not agree, but Donald McCabe has convinced many other respondents.

Q: How will the committee receive the answers?

A: All responses will be sent to Donald McCabe, who does the initial analysis and comparison to similar institutions.

### **3. OTHER BUSINESS**

Betty Hackett suggested that the committee receive a report from the Libraries on their initiatives in developing scholastic skills.

With no further business, Dorothy Anderson thanked the members for attending and adjourned

the meeting.

Becky Hippert  
University Senate