

Minutes*

Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 3, 2000
3:00 – 4:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall

Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Muriel Bebeau, Amber Benning, Linda Brady, Susan Brorson, Percy Chaby, Khaled Dajani, Tim Dunn, Meggan Ellingboe, Paul Enever, Adam Lyche, Joseph Massey, Jason Reed, Gwen Rudney, Chris Shulstad, Charles Speaks, Billie Wahlstrom

Regrets: Sabeen Altaf, David Hamilton, V. Rama Murthy, Paula Rabinowitz,

Absent: Les Drewes,

Guests: Professor Eugene Borgida (Athletic Advisory Committee), Dr. Laura Koch (Academic Counseling); Assistant Vice President Richard Bianco (Institutional Official for Animal Care), Lisa Frankamp (Clinical Research Compliance); Professor Dorothy Anderson, Ms. Betty Hackett (Committee on Student Academic Integrity)

Others: none

[In these minutes:

1. Report from the Athletic Advisory Committee

Professor Morrison convened the meeting at 3:20 and welcomed Professors Eugene Borgida and Laura Koch to report on the activities of the Athletic Advisory Committee (hereinafter AAC).

Professor Borgida began with a review of the monthly meetings of the AAC since January, during which time it has dealt with gender equity, the integration of support services in the two athletic departments (to increase efficiency), a report from the academic counseling office, barriers to communication between athletics and the faculty, the integrity report initiated by the Big Ten Conference, and will talk about the budgets at its May meeting.

This spring he and Professor Evans, chair of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics, will provide President Yudof an overview of the year and will discuss what should be on the agenda next year. The two committees may also develop a memo to players and the athletic departments explaining the two committees; they will also speak with the two faculty representatives, Professors Brady and Weinberg, about enhancing communication between the academic and athletic communities.

* 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 views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Morrison asked if the AAC believes there are adequate controls in place or if there is the potential for further problems. Does the question relate to the recent issues raised about the women's basketball team, Professor Borgida asked (it did); he said the AAC has not discussed the issues that have arisen but that he and Professor Evans have been briefed. Neither the General Counsel's office nor Vice President Brown have brought anything to the AAC and said he did not know if the faculty representatives have been involved. Professor Borgida said, however, that he believes there are adequate institutional controls in place.

Professor Morrison said he was less concerned about whether the AAC was involved than whether the fact there is a problem indicates there is a problem and whether the University should be working on systems to avoid problems in the future. Professor Brady related that there had been a discussion about academic integrity with the Director of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics; the weakness in any system is a failure of personal responsibility. That, in turn, depends on who is hired; some people "will let you down." This is not a question of University oversight but rather of someone acting contrary to principles.

Professor Morrison asked if the AAC was comfortable with the financial situation of the athletic programs. Professor Borgida said they have reviewed budgets and are comfortable in the sense that the men's department is breaking even. They have focused on the commitment of funds from central administration, the largest in the Big Ten, which total about \$8 million (most of which goes to support women's athletics).

One question is about the extent to which there are "off the books" subsidies of athletics, Professor Morrison said, such as loans, services, or loan forgiveness. Professor Borgida said the AAC had asked about the cost of the investigation of the men's basketball team and said he did not know if it was funded with a loan that has not been repaid. He said Vice President Brown assured the Committee the men's department would cover the cost. The Office of the General Counsel absorbed some costs, he added, but the Committee has not generally been informed about the costs, nor has it asked.

Professor Speaks reported that the Committee on Finance and Planning has asked about a recent audit conducted by DeLoitte and Touche; they will receive a copy of the audit to determine if it answers any questions they have.

Professor Morrison asked Dr. Koch for her views. She commented that she is a user of the two committees, in her capacity as interim director of academic counseling for athletics, and that she relies more heavily on the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics, chaired by Professor Sara Evans. It has been a difficult year, she said, with people trying to figure things out and the lack of continuity in personnel. That everyone was relatively new to their jobs created stress; there is a need to work through things and decide what belongs to which athletic committee.

Professor Erdman asked which committee would respond if a crisis arose; he wondered if the system might not overdo things in that event.

Professor Morrison observed that it is a new structure and that the new committees are asked to report to this Committee twice a year. The Committee members can ask questions and stimulate thought but will not jump in if a crisis develops. He thanked Professor Borgida and Dr. Koch for joining the meeting and expressed appreciation for their work.

2. Policy on Use of Controlled Substances in Research

Professor Morrison turned next to Mr. Bianco to review the proposed changes in the policy governing use of controlled substances in research. Mr. Bianco recalled that about a year ago proposed changes were presented to the Senate Research Committee and the Senate and were approved; during implementation, they discovered that there were problems with the language in the view of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Ms. Frankamp reviewed the proposed changes to the policy.

Professor Morrison noted that proposed changes to policy need to go to the Senate but that there will be no meeting until September. The Committee is authorized to approve changes on behalf of the Senate for the interim, subject to confirmation of the changes by the Senate. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed changes on an interim basis.

3. Report on the Student Academic Integrity Committee

Professor Morrison now welcomed Professor Dorothy Anderson and Ms. Betty Hackett to the meeting to report on the initial work of the Committee on Student Academic Integrity.

Professor Anderson explained that the committee had met once, in April, and considered the issues of the academic integrity pledge proposed by the Clayton Committee, an honors system, and when any proposals should take effect. The committee decided it did not know enough to make any decisions and has scheduled a 5-hour meeting in May to get people up to speed. The committee did conclude it would not take action on a pledge this year and that it wanted to hear from Ms. Hackett about her expectations of the committee. Some surmise that it may take four or five years to get a pledge in place and that it might look like something was being shoved down the throat of the colleges. The committee was not familiar with the work of the Clayton Committee or its report, she observed.

Professor Morrison thanked Professor Anderson for agreeing to serve on the committee and for serving as convener of the first meetings (the committee does not yet have a chair identified). He noted that the process of appointing members had gone very slowly, which had been disappointing, but expressed appreciation that the committee was finally functioning. He turned to Ms. Hackett to inquire what was different today from twelve months ago.

Beyond talking about the logistics of getting pledges signed by 40,000 students, Ms. Hackett said, there have been discussions with student orientation staff about increasing the attention paid to issues of integrity. She also visited the Crookston campus to talk about academic integrity and how to improve the learning environment for students with respect to academic integrity. In the hopper there are a number of issues: logos for academic integrity, a web site with resources for students and faculty, surveys about levels of cheating, connections with program people in the office of the Vice President for Research on the responsible conduct of research so there is collaborative work and the emphasis on academic integrity is not solely on undergraduate education, letters to faculty expressing appreciation to them for reporting incidents of suspected cheating, and to receive reports from all colleges about incidents of cheating.

Her goal with a fall workshop with student groups is to have students involved, because that is what is required if the effort to minimize cheating is to be successful. She would like to have an ethics seminar required as part of the discipline for students who are found to have cheated. She will work with the Admissions Office to have materials on academic integrity included in admissions materials so that students do not just sign an isolated pledge when they arrive at the University.

Is there a way to reach faculty who are hesitant to report cheating, Professor Massey asked? They must be reached. Ms. Hackett said she would like to have college and department meetings this summer so there can be more substance on the web site about contacting her office. It could, for example, provide information about whether faculty will be sued and how to confront students.

Professor Morrison noted that he reports to the Board of Regents about every three months; each time, he said, he is asked what is being done to implement the report of the Clayton Committee on student academic integrity. The new committee and Ms. Hackett must, for now, concentrate on what is visible, or the questions will not stop. The Regents are clearly interested in seeing things move along. He said he has the sense some do not want to think about the subject because it is not nice.

Professor Anderson said the new committee thinks the subject is important. It may, as a first step, endorse a statement prepared by Ms. Melin of New Student Orientation that would be provided to all incoming first-year students. Ms. Hackett said that the Clayton Committee recommended that responsibility for academic integrity should not be attached to an existing position; for some while, her job as Student Judicial Officer did not change, but recently she has been provided staff and moved to a new office. She said there would be steady, long-term, incremental steps, and that the University does not want a quick fix.

Professor Morrison thanked Professor Anderson and Ms. Hackett and said the Committee would look forward to hearing from them again next year.

He adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand