

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 1, 2006

[In these minutes: Gopher Stadium, Plagiarism/Academic Dishonesty]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University 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: Matt Painschab, chair, Jon Ruzak, Kendre Turonie, Iraj Bashiri, Jean-Marie Del-Santo, Carolyn Nayematsu, Janet Schottel, Nathan Pelzer, Jeffrey Wencl, Caroline Younts

REGRETS: Amelious Whyte, Jennifer Engler, Kim Roufs, Jesse Berglund, Jenn Funke, Maria McRae, Hilary Ploeckelmann

ABSENT: Samantha Peloquin

OTHER: Tina Falkner

GUESTS: Sharon Dzik, Director Student Judicial Affairs and the Office of Student Academic Integrity; Phil Esten, Assistant Athletics Director; Lynn Holleran, Associate to the Vice President and Chief of Staff; Joel Maturi, Director of Athletics

I). Matt Painschab called the meeting to order.

II). Mr. Painschab noted that the committee has been discussing a Gopher Stadium resolution. To help make an informed decision on whether to endorse the resolution and learn more about the project, Mr. Painschab welcomed today's guests, Phil Esten, Lynn Holleran and Joel Maturi.

Mr. Maturi began by providing an overview of the stadium project. He noted that the culture in America is such that athletics plays an important role on most college campuses. Unfortunately for University of Minnesota students, the football experience is missing. Regardless if students are football fans or not, an on-campus football experience adds to the culture and climate of an institution. With this said, the University needs to find a permanent home for the University of Minnesota Gophers. The Metrodome is not the answer.

The lease with the Metrodome expires in 2011, and both the Twins and the Vikings have said they will not play in the dome after 2011. This would leave the Gophers as the only tenant with an estimated \$7 to \$8 million in annual expenses to run the Metrodome. This does not include the funding that would be necessary for the maintenance on the 20 plus year old building.

Mr. Maturi emphasized that a lot of work went into developing a funding model, which would raise enough money to build a Gopher Stadium. The model that has been proposed provides for the University raising 60% of the necessary funds and requesting the remaining 40% be funded through state bonds. He added that as this model was being discussed, President Bruininks took the firm position that the University would not request more than 40% funding from the state for a stadium so as not to interfere with the University's academic mission.

In order for the University to raise its 60% share, it plans to ask students who will use the facility to pay up to \$50 per semester. This student fee is expected to generate approximately \$53 million in bonding revenue towards the \$150 million that the University needs to raise. The administration recognizes that \$50 per semester represents a significant amount of money for students. The fee, however, would provide benefits to all students, whether they are athletically inclined or not. Besides holding football games in the stadium the facility will be used for other events e.g. commencement proceedings, concerts, etc. The stadium will be more than a place to play football.

The University is fortunate to have enough land to build an on-campus stadium. If the University does not act now to build a new stadium, it is likely it will lose the opportunity to bring football back to campus forever. Supporters of the new stadium are excited about the prospect of bringing Gopher football back on campus.

Like most Big 10 institutions, the University's athletics program is financially challenged. Based on conservative estimates, if the Gophers had played football on-campus last year, the University would have generated approximately \$3.5 million net additional dollars to the bottom line of Intercollegiate Athletics.

Next, Ms. Holleran provided members with information concerning the history of the current stadium discussions. She noted that during the 2002 – 2003 academic year, at the request of the legislature, the University discussed with the Minnesota Vikings the possibility of a joint-use stadium on campus. Late that academic year, a decision was made to not move forward with this option. However, the University still needed to resolve its stadium conundrum because in 2011 the Metrodome contract is due to expire.

As a result, in the fall of 2003, the University decided to conduct a feasibility study to determine if the University could build an on-campus, collegiate style stadium given the University's financing, resources, etc. Results of the feasibility study indicated that an on-campus stadium was doable, and, in turn, the University concluded that it was the best option for the institution.

The feasibility study identified funding opportunities for a new stadium, which included a state contribution, corporate sponsorships, private fund-raising, parking revenue and a student contribution. The administration was very forthcoming from the onset with students about this proposed student contribution, and solicited their input concerning a student fee model.

Based on input from students it was recommended that a student fee be phased-in. Students felt strongly that only students who would have an opportunity to use the stadium should pay for it. Additionally, students indicated that besides the intangible benefits a stadium would bring to campus, they wanted tangible benefits. A copy of the Student Stadium Benefit/Fee Model was distributed to members for their review. Ms. Holleran emphasized that this model is based heavily on student input. While not all students feel comfortable paying \$50/semester for an on-campus stadium, in order to make this project a reality, all information suggests a student fee would be necessary.

Mr. Esten highlighted a handful of benefits under consideration in the draft version of the Student Stadium Benefit/Fee Model:

- Affordable student football season ticket prices. Currently, the University has the second lowest student season ticket prices in the Big 10. While season ticket prices will likely increase for inflationary reasons, every attempt will be made to hold prices down to an affordable level.
- Goldy VIP Cards will be distributed free of charge to students. This card will provide students with free admission to all general admission Gopher sporting events and offer benefits at local supporting partners.
- Dedicated student space in the stadium for game day and non-game day activities.
- Dedicated student seating in the stadium.
- Student representation on the Stadium Programming Advisory Board.
- Ticket availability for other select events in the stadium whenever possible.
- Revenue generating possibilities for students groups i.e. a percentage of student concession stand sales, etc.
- Arts and other entertainment benefits yet to be determined.

If students took advantage of all the proposed benefits listed on the handout, it would equate to more than a \$50/semester value.

Assuming the stadium would open in 2009, the phased in fee model would have freshmen and sophomores start paying the stadium fee in the fall of 2007. Then, in 2008, juniors would be assessed the fee, and finally by 2009, all students would be paying the fee.

Questions/comments following this presentation included:

- Regarding the statement that approximately \$3.5 million net additional dollars would have added to the bottom line of Intercollegiate Athletics if the Gophers had played on-campus last year, how was this estimate calculated? Mr. Maturi noted that this calculation took into consideration that the University would earn more in concession sales than it does at the Metrodome as well as revenue from suites, signage and an increase in the number of ticket sold.
- How many student employee positions are expected to be generated with an on-campus stadium? Mr. Maturi stated that a 50,000 seat stadium is being proposed with the infrastructure to be able to expand to 80,000 seats at some point in the future assuming there is a demand. Naturally, a facility of this size would offer numerous, convenient employment opportunities for students. Mr. Esten added

that as part of the environmental review process there are also plans to devote resources to student internships.

- Is there any information available on-line that would indicate where the proposed stadium would be built? Mr. Esten referred members to following URL: <http://www1.umn.edu/stadium/index.php>.
- Will tailgating be allowed? It was noted that "pre-game festivities" would be permitted.
- Does the cost estimate to build the stadium include infrastructure costs i.e. road construction, etc.? Yes, stated Mr. Esten, the estimate is very comprehensive. The feasibility study that was conducted in 2003 identified three financial arms of the project - the site, the district and the stadium itself. Mr. Maturi added that in many respects it is less expensive to build new than it is to renovate. He cited Ohio State's stadium renovation (>\$200 million) and Wisconsin's stadium renovation (>\$100 million). The proposed Gopher Stadium would be a nice stadium, but not lavish.
- What attractions and discounts will be available using the Goldy VIP Card? This is still under negotiation. The goal is to have the card be of value to all students.
- If the stadium fee were optional for graduate and professional students, what impact would this have on the University's projections in terms of raising \$53 million from student fees? According to Ms. Holleran, given the nature of buying debt, it would be impossible to do so if graduate and professional students were given the option of opting in and out of paying the stadium fee.
- Did Ohio State impose a fee on its students to help build its stadium? If so, what did students get in exchange for paying a fee? Mr. Maturi stated that as the University drafted its Student Benefit Model, it was difficult to find another model that was as comprehensive as the University's model in terms of providing a direct, proportionate benefit to students for paying a fee. He added, however, that most Division 1 schools do not have student fees to support athletics because they generate enough money through football and basketball games.
- Will liquor be sold at the stadium? No.
- Which units/departments will be housed in the stadium complex? Ms. Holleran stated that while units, departments and student groups will likely be able to reserve space for special events in the stadium, only the Marching Band would be housed in this facility.

Matt Painschab thanked Mr. Esten, Ms. Holleran and Mr. Maturi for providing the committee with a Gopher Stadium update. Ms. Holleran added that if members have additional questions regarding the stadium to direct them to her, Mr. Esten or the stadium website: <http://www1.umn.edu/stadium/index.php>

After the presentation, a member voiced her extreme disappointment that consideration is being given to assessing students a fee for a Gopher Stadium. Mr. Painschab acknowledged this member's concern and stated that the committee would continue its discussion of this item at its March 1st meeting.

III). Mr. Painschab welcomed Sharon Dzik from the Office of Student Academic Integrity (OSAI) who was invited to provide information on plagiarism. Ms. Dzik distributed handouts to facilitate her presentation and highlighted the following:

Indications that a paper may have been plagiarized include, but are not limited to:

- A change in style from the students regular writing style.
- Unusual citation styles.
- Last minute topic changes.
- Unusual word choices.
- Typographical errors from scanning or cutting and pasting a paper.
- Presence of a URL printed on the paper. Or, dark lines, which could indicate the URL was covered up and the paper was recopied.
- References to illustrations or tables that are not included.
- Reference to a course or assignment that is not accurate.

Ways to verify plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Ask the student.
- Conduct a Google search using quotation marks around the phrase(s) that seems out of place.
- Browse paper mill websites.

If scholastic dishonesty has likely occurred, the next steps should be to:

- Inform the student that he/she needs to set up an appointment with the instructor. Prior to this appointment, the faculty member should have in mind a suitable penalty or outcome based on the stated expectations and standards for the class or assignment.
- Present the student with the information and evidence that has formed the basis of the academic dishonesty conclusion.
- Provide the student with an opportunity to respond. Take the student's response into account and indicate what action will be taken including that the matter will be reported to the Office of Student Academic Integrity (OSAI).
- Send the student's report with all pertinent documents, including a copy of the syllabus to OSAI. OSAI, in turn, will send the student a letter confirming the report or misconduct and the penalty assigned. The OSAI letter will be copied to the faculty member and sent to the student and the student's collegiate student affairs office. This letter will outline additional resolution options and recordkeeping practices.

The University of Minnesota's philosophy with respect to academic dishonesty places a primary emphasis on educational development and a secondary emphasis on punishment. Informal intervention and resolution are attempted whenever possible.

OSAI should be the central repository for academic dishonesty charges at the University and colleges should not be handling these matters internally. An outcome of failing to have a central repository for these charges is that repeat offenders will go undetected.

There are two resolution options around academic dishonesty, an informal educational option and a formal option, which would involve a hearing with full application of due process mechanisms. Most cases are resolved informally.

Questions/comments from members:

- Are students recruited to share information concerning academic dishonesty? Yes, stated Ms. Dzik who shared information on OSAI's Student Advocates for Academic Integrity Program. This program has three different modules from which to choose: The Cheating Trap, Academic Integrity 101, and Plagiarism. These presentations are typically short in duration, but can be customized. Ms. Dzik noted that faculty and other members of the University who have taken advantage of this service have found it very beneficial.
- How is the Student Advocates for Academic Integrity Program communicated? Ms. Dzik noted that each college has a student service representative who should be sharing this information with faculty within their colleges.
- What kind of adjudication methods are currently used to deal with students that violate the Student Code of Conduct, and how would this change if the University decides to apply its code off-campus? Ms. Dzik stated that the question that needs to be asked is what criteria should be put in place to decide if an off-campus case rises to the level of needing to be adjudicated. Many institutions with codes that apply off-campus use as their criteria a nexus, which links off-campus activity to on-campus standards.
- Is there a separate judicial process for matters that occur in the residence halls? Yes, stated Ms. Dzik, the residence halls currently process most of their own judicial matters except, however, when it rises to the level of evicting a person from the residence hall.
- Does the Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC) work with Student Judicial Affairs? Yes, oftentimes Office for Student Academic Integrity (OSAI) refers students to SCRC (<http://www1.umn.edu/sos/aboutus.htm>), which offers a wide range of services to help students deal with their campus-based complaints and concerns. The SCRC offers ombudsman and advocate services for students.
- What information goes in a student's file if he/she is found guilty of, for example, plagiarism? All information pertinent to the case is kept for seven years unless the case is an expulsion or suspension in which case the information could be kept longer. Ms. Dzik stated that students' transcripts are completely separate from OSAI records. However, if a student is caught cheating a second time and suspension results, during the length of the suspension only the transcript will denote that the student is not permitted to register at the University of Minnesota without permission from OSAI.
- Does OSAI handle inquiries from schools processing admission applications regarding whether a particular student has a record on file with OSAI? The Office for Student Academic Integrity handles numerous requests of this nature. In responding OSAI sends out a form letter, which indicates that either a record exists or does not exist. Should a record exist, however, the letter provides minimal detail. Students must sign a public release form authorizing OSAI to

send their information. Ms. Dzik stated that she encourages students to be honest about their student discipline record when asked.

- Should graduate and professional programs be referring cases of academic dishonesty to OSAI? Yes.

IV). Members unanimously approved the December 2, 2005 minutes.

V). Hearing no further business, Matt Painschab adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate