

[In these minutes: OSCAI Update, Update on review of scholastic dishonesty within the professional schools, Update on withdrawal email, Update on McCabe survey, Discussion of grade assignment for scholastic dishonesty when a hearing is pending]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2011

[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: Eric Watkins (Chair), Sharon Dzik, Patricia Fillipi, Jennifer Goodnough, Laura Coffin Koch, Tom Shield, LeAnn Snow.

ABSENT: Levi Atinda, Dana Davis, Francisco Ocampo.

1. OSCAI UPDATE

Sharon Dzik noted that her office has been focusing on outreach, prevention, and education on all items within the Student Conduct Code. Part of this focus was participating in a Welcome Week Open House for Student Affairs. Freshmen were invited to the building last week and participated in a game of Student Conduct Code Jeopardy. This game is also being made available to the Residence Hall Advisors so that they can hold sessions within the dorms.

An ad will also be run during the second week of classes with a Know the Code quiz. Students as well as faculty are encouraged to participate.

She is working on the email to faculty regarding her office and policies. This is planned for October. A committee member asked that these types of emails be directed to instructors teaching that semester instead of using just the faculty list since otherwise teaching academic professionals are missed.

While final figures are not in, it appears that there will be over 200 scholastic dishonesty cases reported to her office this year. This shows a steady increase, but barely covers the number of offenses actually taking place on campus.

Lastly she is working with the Graduate School on an interim process for reporting of graduate students. Once a new provost is in place, a final decision will be made about the Graduate School and then this committee can revisit the reporting procedure it approved.

2. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY WITHIN THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Tom Shield stated that the committee defined procedures for handling scholastic dishonesty reporting for undergraduates and graduate students a few years ago and then turned to the professional schools. The hope was that their procedures were more standardized but what the committee found was that there is a broad range between the different schools.

Eric Watkins noted that all the schools have been met with, except for Pharmacy which is scheduled for October. The idea is then to write a summary report.

Tom Shield said that he envisioned this report being made to the Provost with a copy to the Faculty Consultative Committee Chair. It would review what the committee learned during this process and highlight both good and bad examples.

3. UPDATE ON EMAIL WHEN STUDENTS WITHDRAW

Eric Watkins stated that the grading policy was recently changed to not allow students to withdraw from a class when they would be receiving an 'F' for scholastic dishonesty. However, the committee discussed that most faculty might not know that a student has withdrawn until they try to enter the final grade. The committee then discussed having an automatic email sent to all faculty when any student withdraws after the third week.

He and Tom Shield met with Vice Provost McMaster and Sue Van Voorhis about this proposal. While Vice Provost McMaster thought that an email would be helpful for all students withdrawing and would be easy to implement in PeopleSoft, Sue Van Voorhis thought that there were too many emails to faculty. Eric Watkins then asked about a weekly update, but the programming cost would be too high.

The committee then made the following comments:

- Large classes should not be exempt as emails will be more helpful
- Emails need a recognizable subject line
- Instructions should be provided on how to set-up a filter in Gmail
- Withdrawal emails should be sent on all campuses
- Instructors will need to forward information to TAs in large classes
- Instructors of record should receive the withdrawal email
- If implemented, an introductory email needs to be sent to all instructors
- Emails should start after week 5

Eric Watkins said that he would continue to work with Vice Provost McMaster on this issue.

4. UPDATE ON MCCABE SURVEY

Sharon Dzik stated that Donald McCabe is a national researcher on the topic of academic integrity. He has developed a survey for K-12 and colleges to assess academic integrity trends. Twin Cities campus faculty and students participated in the survey in 2004 and she would like to redo the survey this academic year. Members agreed that mid-February would be a good time for this survey. She will have an update for the next meeting.

5. DISCUSSION OF GRADE ASSIGNMENT FOR SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY WHEN A HEARING IS PENDING

Sharon Dzik said that she has a question to post to the committee. When a student is alleged to have violated the scholastic dishonesty provision of the Student Conduct Code, the instructor makes an initial decision about the sanction. This grade is then put on a student's transcript. Students, who then decide to go to a hearing, have asked why the instructor-assigned grade remains on the transcript while the hearing is pending as this can have adverse effects on the student. Should her office counsel faculty to delay posting a grade, use an 'I', or clarify the policy that the grade assignment is the authority of the instructor?

Members made the following comments:

- This same question was posed at Morris and the campus was opposed to using the 'I'. Instead it was decided that since a student should be not responsible until proven responsible, a final grade would not be assigned and if the violation occurs at the end of

the class, the instructor will consult with the associate dean first. A backup option was to use the 'K' grade.

- If the instructor assigns a penalty, then he or she has already determined that the student is responsible for the violation. Therefore assigning an 'I' should not be encouraged.
- It is University policy that assigning a grade is the responsibility of the instructor.
- Consistency is needed
- Policy wording should be clarified to state that the instructor can post the grade that he or she chooses to assign
- OSCAI should still work with instructors to find good solutions

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Eric Watkins said that online course best practices was discussed last spring as a possible topic for this year. The topic should be reconsidered in the spring as the committee will be busy this semester with the McCabe survey and professional school report. With no further business, Eric Watkins thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate