

[In these minutes: Scholastic Dishonesty within the Medical School, Updates, W grade]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2010

[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), Lisa Anderson, Sarah Angerman, Arthur Carlson, Sharon Dzik, Jennifer Goodnough, Laura Coffin Koch, Randy Moore, Andrew Olson, Lesley Scibora, Eric Watkins.

REGRETS: Dana Davis, Kendall King.

GUESTS: Dr. Kathleen Watson.

1. SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY ALLEGATIONS HANDLED WITHIN THE MEDICAL SCHOOL

Tom Shield introduced Dr. Kathleen Watson, Associate Professor of Medicine and Assistant Dean for Students and Student Learning to speak on the process for scholastic dishonesty cases in the Medical School.

Dr. Watson said that the medical profession requires that students are monitored while at the University and are recruited for integrity and professionalism. The admissions process asks about chemical dependency, reports of cheating, and general questions of integrity.

Medical students are in classes during the first two years and work with patients in the next two years. The college code states that there is a Student Peer Review Committee (SPRC) that receives reports of scholastic dishonesty; these reports are not sent to her office. There are six to eight cases reported by students each year.

She said that there was a change in the college's secure exam policy this year. Proctors are now only provided when required, such as during third and fourth year Board exams. Otherwise students are responsible for monitoring each other. When proctors were used, there were only two scholastic dishonesty cases from exams reported in two years.

If a student sees a case of scholastic dishonesty, they can choose to report the incident to a faculty member, the SPRC, or her. However there have been no reports to her or the Scholastic Standing Committee (SSC) in five years.

The SPRC is composed of students elected by other students. There is a faculty advisor appointed by Dr. Watson. The SSC is composed of faculty and two students appointed by the faculty assembly. The chair is one of the faculty members. There is also an administrator as an ex officio member.

When a report is made to the SPRC, they investigate and if they feel that the issue is resolved, there is nothing further to be done and there is no report of the incident in the student file. If it is a serious violation, they can refer the matter to her or the SSC.

Dr. Watson noted that the processes are under review this year.

Members made the following comments:

- The student record should be accessed when making determinations but the SPRC does not have access to this information
- All cases need to be reported to OSCAI for complete reporting and tracking repeat offenders
- There is a difference between behavioral violations and academic grievances as well as boundary ethics and academic violations

Tom Shield suggested that the college make sure that its processes are written down so that the same policy can be followed for each student charged. The college should also work with OSCAI to make sure that all cases are being reported.

2. OSCAI UPDATES

Sharon Dzik said that the student disciplinary background checks survey for professional programs has been underway for two weeks. There has been a low response rate from the few hundred Dental, Medical, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, and Law schools that were sent the survey. She is hoping to use these results with faculty who do not want to report undergraduate scholastic dishonesty because they feel that it will ruin a student's chance for admission to a professional program. She will bring the results to a future meeting.

She then noted that there have already been 500 cases this year which in six months is higher than the total for 12 months last year. This is partly due to an increase in off-campus charges.

The committee then discussed expanding the charge to include all forms of student conduct. Members argued that the expertise on the committee is focused on academics and that this issue is too important to dilute it with other forms of conduct. There are also other committees that can handle the other forms of conduct.

3. DISCUSSION OF W GRADE

Tom Shield presented the recent change in the Grading and Transcript Policy that was approved by the Faculty Senate. This change prevents a student from withdrawing from a class when charged with scholastic dishonesty. This was previously just a CLA policy but has now been expanded to include all students at the Twin Cities, Morris, and Rochester.

Q: Is there an overrule process for a student?

A: There is always a petition process for students and a faculty member could agree to allow the withdrawal.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

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

Becky Hippert
University Senate