

[In these minutes: OSAI Update, Review of an Action plan for the survey summary, Students retaking classes]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2005

1:30 – 3:00 PM

510 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: Micky Trent (Chair), Dorothy Anderson, Lizette Barthodhi, Shawn Curley, Sharon Dzik, Marilyn Grave, Derek Johnson, Linda Jones, Laura Coffin Koch, Robert Pepin, David Sullivan-Nightengale.

REGRETS: Meghan Keil.

ABSENT: Jeremy Deitz, Paul Myers.

GUESTS: Kathy Skelton.

1. OSAI UPDATE

Sharon Dzik said that five students completed training as Student Advocates for Integrity and have presented to six different classes so far this semester. There are another 11 classes on the schedule for presentations, but they cannot handle many more within the next 2-3 weeks. They also staffed a table during the First-year programs event last week. Evaluations from the presentations look good.

Q: Is which classes have presentations been given?

A: General College, Natural Resources, Chemistry, and Performing Arts.

Q: How can faculty find out about this program?

A: A message was sent to OSAI contacts in each college asking them to forward it to faculty. A message was also sent to faculty who reported cases to OSAI last semester.

Q: When did this program start?

A: Advocates were trained last November, but the first presentation was not given until January

21.

Q: Are you looking for students now for next year's program?

A: There was a sign-up sheet at the table last week, but one of the new people in the office will be in charge of recruitment. Two advocates have expressed interest in continuing next year.

A member noted that freshmen seminar instructors should be a target for this program.

She then said that job descriptions for two positions, associate director and assistant director, in her office will be posted within a week.

2. REVIEW OF AND ACTION PLAN FOR THE SURVEY SUMMARY

Micky Trent reviewed the first draft of the survey summary, which follows the format of the survey. No statistician has reviewed the data, so there is no notation that any of the figures are statistically significant. She would like feedback on what else should be included or what information should be trimmed from the summary.

Members made the following comments:

- Readers will not focus on the numbers so summary should provide some visual representation
- Student and faculty comments should be included as an appendix, with identifiers stripped
- Comments should be categorized for skimming purposes
- Include goals of the survey, to get a gauge for the campus and provide guidance in future measures
- Summary can be used in OSAI outreach
- Perception on sharing information on assignments should be used in faculty training
- Report could include a section at the end on next steps, or this could be included in a follow-up report
- Committee's goal would be to increase faculty and student awareness of policies
- Summary should allow people to adapt it for use in their own department rather than setting University-wide goals
- Summary will set goals for OSAI

Micky Trent asked member to let her know what information should be included in the introduction to allow readers to understand the survey. These comments should be forwarded to her within a week. Information about age distributions will be added to the introduction as well.

Groups to be targeted for presentations include:

- Educational Policy Committee (SCEP)
- Council of Undergraduate Deans (CUD)

- Council of Graduate Deans
- Dean's Council
- Minnesota Student Association (MSA)
- Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA)
- Senate Consultative Committee (SCC)
- First-Year Orientation
- Residential Advisors
- Academic Advisors

Individuals that should receive the report are: Jerry Rinehart, Craig Swan, and Thomas Sullivan.

3. OTHER BUSINESS

A member asked if a student can retake the same class with the same instructor in which they received a failing grade due to scholastic dishonesty.

Members made the following comments:

- Instructor cannot currently bar the student from retaking the class with him or her, especially when there is no alternative
- Is it fair to the student to have the same instructor?
- There is a difference between a policy and a recommendation
- Whenever possible, a student should not retake the course with the same instructor
- If this becomes a policy, it might assume that faculty are unable to be fair the second time the student takes the class

With no further business, Micky Trent thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate