

[In these minutes: Faculty reporting process, Academic Integrity Week]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2006

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view of, nor are they binding on the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Tom Shield (Chair), Mark Bellcourt, Francisco Diez-Gonzalez, Sharon Dzik, Laura Coffin Koch, Robert Pepin, Micky Trent.

REGRETS: Shawn Curley, Linda Jones.

ABSENT: Paul Myers, Abbie Stohlmann.

GUESTS: Debbie Gettemy, Kathy Skelton.

1. UPDATE ON FACULTY REPORTING PROCESS

Tom Shield distributed a new reporting diagram, based on the discussion at the last meeting. The process is the same for undergraduates and graduate students. The DUGS and DGS would be responsible for making sure that faculty are centrally reporting. He proposed taking the model to CUD for their feedback and implementation help.

Members made the following comments:

- Diagram should include instructor communication with the student
- Will educating DUGS/DGS help reach the goal of increasing reporting?
- DUGS/DGS are not involved now and are not being taken advantage of to help improve the process
- Can faculty still directly report to OSCAI? If so, then a copy needs to go to the DUGS/DGS or the DUGS/DGS need to sign off on the form
- DUGS/DGS should be educated on the key points of reporting and help remind faculty how important reporting is
- Enforcement might still be an issue for some colleges
- For notification, the arrow should go to the student, with a dotted line, meaning cc, to the other boxes

Q: Is the college offering the course the ending point for the reporting process?

A: It would be the ending point, unless a student requests a hearing. Communication once a hearing is requested is not included on the diagram.

A member said that the diagrams do not pertain to professional programs and wanted to make sure that a 'one size fits all' approach was not being used. The committee decided to focus on undergraduate reporting for the remainder of the meeting and address graduate and professional school processes at a later date.

Members then made the following comments regarding undergraduate reporting:

- A designated person will be better for handling these cases and to be used as a resource for OSCAI
- Process should involve minimal work for faculty
- On-line form should be considered, similar to that for grant proposals, which can automatically email copies to the appropriate parties
- Education should continue while the form is being updated
- Reporting to a central agency still hinders some faculty
- The most important link that is currently missing is a local, definite contact person within the college for each faculty member to talk to about cases
- Deans can make it clear to the DUGS about the importance of their role in the process
- Language should be added to the form, explaining the importance of reporting all cases – which is not to punish one-time offenders but is to catch repeat offenders
- It might be more successful to remind faculty to report cases at times when incidents are occurring, such as mid-terms and finals, instead of before the academic year starts
- Faculty can report cases later since there is no time limit on reporting, so an end of the semester reminder could catch all cases for the semester
- OSCAI needs to release reporting numbers back to faculty to have them address the root causes of the low numbers
- Duluth requires faculty to report cases

Sharon Dzik said that work still needs to be done on eliminating the faculty perception of a file in OSCAI that can hurt the student later.

Members made the following comments:

- Should one-time offenders be kept separate and treated differently?
- Should one-time offenders be reported when professional schools ask?
- Files are also created for other minor code violations, such as using a handicap parking permit. How would one decide which violations to report? Who makes this decision?
- Should there be levels of scholastic dishonesty?
- Students will know that they have one time to cheat without it being reported to an outside agency
- A student's program would know of the incident and is in the position to write a letter of recommendation
- What do other Big Ten institutions do?

Tom Shield noted that the committee would continue to focus on the undergraduate process. The diagram will be revised and text will be added to explain the diagrams. These revisions will be brought to the committee in February for review, and he will get time on the February or March CUD agenda to discuss this process with them. Once this process is finalized and in place, the committee can focus on graduate and professional school reporting.

2, REPORT ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY WEEK

Debbie Gettemy stated that, overall, the week was not successful due to the low attendance numbers, but that there were a few exceptions. One was that the Minnesota Daily videotaped the mock CCSB hearing and had the video clip on their website. The second was that there was no attendance at some information sessions for students, but students did call the departments doing the sessions to ask for copies of handouts that were distributed.

For next year, better advertising and more evening events for students are needed.

Members then made the following comments:

- Advertising should be done on the portals since 86 percent of first-year students log in weekly
- Student representatives are also needed on the planning committee
- DUGS could also be used for advertising
- Faculty should be contacted six months in advance to work the activities into course assignments

3. OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, Tom Shield thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate