

[In these minutes: OSCAI Updates, Report from Duluth on Academic Integrity Process and Procedure, ConC Review]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC) MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2014

[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: Jennifer Goodnough (Chair), Ragui Assaad, Kimberly Clarke, Sharon Dzik, Kacey Gregerson, Stacy Ingraham, Corrie Marion.

REGRETS: Arthur Erdman, April Kim, Laura Coffin Koch, Susan LoRusso, LeAnn Snow.

GUESTS: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Rick McCormick, Steve Pearthree, Jerry Pepper, Nathaniel Schulz, Fang Yu.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions were made of all members present.

2. OSCAI UPDATES

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn said that after input, including from this committee, the restorative justice program for scholastic dishonesty violations has been named AIM – Academic Integrity Matters. Recruitment for members will start in the next few weeks so that trials can happen in spring semester.

She then asked the committee if instructors would want to see the written explanation from the students who complete the program. Members felt that most instructors would not want to see this information. However, if a student rewrites an assignment, it might be helpful for it to be read by the instructor.

3. REPORT FROM DULUTH ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCESS AND PROCEDURE

Jerry Pepper, Associate Vice Chancellor Undergraduate Education at Duluth, and Nathaniel Schulz, Director of the Student Conduct Office at Duluth, joined the meeting to discuss academic integrity processes and procedures at their campus.

Nathaniel Schulz began by reviewing statistics:

- 2011 – 9782 students enrolled, 900 cases reported of which 70 were scholastic dishonesty
- 2012 – 9452 students enrolled, 680 cases reported of which 46 were scholastic dishonesty
- 2013 – 9239 students enrolled, 661 cases reported of which 20 were scholastic dishonesty
- 2014 – 9395 students enrolled, 157 cases reported so far of which 3 were scholastic dishonesty

He noted that scholastic dishonesty cases are handled by the faculty and his office monitors for repeat offenders.

Associate Vice Chancellor Pepper stated that there is variation in reporting as some faculty do not want to create a formal report. In 2004 the Educational Oversight Committee created a task force to investigate the scholastic dishonesty process and the current policy was approved in 2005. This policy change clarified scholastic dishonesty violations, the role of the Student Conduct Office, and created a form to track violations and repeat offenders. He said that he only becomes involved when there is a repeat offender.

Nathaniel Schulz then referred members to a handout on their process. The faculty identifies the alleged violation, meets with the student to present options, and fills out the form. If a student accepts the faculty member's decision, then the sanction stands. His office just sends the student an email to alert them of their option to challenge the decision. If a student denies the violation, the college academic complaint officer gathers information for the associate dean to make a decision. It is at this point that Associate Vice Chancellor Pepper becomes involved if the student is a repeat offender. If a student appeals the decision of the associate dean, then the grievance committee, which is a three-member group in each college, handles the appeal.

Q: How do faculty complete the form?

A: At this time the campus is not using Maxient for online scholastic dishonesty reports. Instead faculty complete a paper form which is uploaded into Maxient.

Q: Can scholastic dishonesty decisions be sent to the student grievance committee?

A: It is possible but that option is rarely used.

Q: Has Duluth conducted a survey on how often students are committing scholastic dishonesty?

A: A survey has not been done in the last two years. In a survey done in an organizational ethics course, 86 percent reported that they knew a student who had cheated and 15 percent admitted to cheating themselves.

Q: Have there been any changes made in the Duluth process?

A: Yes Students are no longer asked to sign the faculty member's scholastic dishonesty report since for many students a signature implied that they were agreeing with the information.

Q: How are cases across system campuses handled?

A: FERPA allows institutions to share information that they need to know which allows all the campuses to share information on students who might have had a violation at one campus and have a violation at another campus. All the student conduct offices have good lines of communication.

Q: Should the policy be clarified for students to alert them that violations are shared between campuses?

A: There is an email that students now receive stating that their case is being referred to their home campus.

Q: Does Duluth use the three violations and a student is out concept for scholastic dishonesty violations?

A: Sanctions are handled on a case-by-case basis. For most first violations, the faculty determines the sanction. If there are two incidents that happen at close to the same time, they are

usually treated as one. A second violation usually requires educational compliance and a third violation would involve suspension. International students are considered a bit differently.

Q: Is a suspension shown on a transcript?

A: No. At Duluth a hold is placed on a student record when they are suspended which does not permit the student to register or obtain a transcript through the normal process.

Members made the following comments:

- There is a student member on the hearing body at Morris
- Faculty perception is still that all cases go to a hearing and that the faculty's decision is overturned; this needs to be addressed
- Email to instructors on the Twin Cities has helped to boost reports
- Email should be sent to department heads/chairs in early November asking them to address reporting of scholastic dishonesty at a faculty meeting
- Students should be provided time to consider the violation and sanction before being required to sign
- Morris typically suspends a student after a second scholastic dishonesty violation if there are no extenuating circumstances

4. CONC REVIEW

Steven Pearthree, Fang Yu, and Rich McCormick, three members of the Committee on Committees (ConC), joined the meeting to discuss the review being done this year of the SAIC. They reviewed the process being used, noted that the ConC Chair has already met with Professor Goodnough, and how confidential comments can be shared after today's discussion.

They then collected feedback from the committee on the following questions:

Q: Thinking of what the committee has done in the past few years, does the charge encompass these efforts?

A: Yes.

Q: Are there enough/too many members?

A: The distribution seems appropriate but the number in attendance varies by month due to members' availability. Student members, especially from the system campuses, are hard to recruit and keep.

Q: Is the membership distribution – type of members, gender, campus, etc. – adequate?

A: It might be helpful to have a department head or chair as a member to get their perspective on issues. A representative from the libraries has been very helpful. P&A members who teach might be more likely to understand student issues.

Q: Is the process for selecting members and the chair appropriate?

A: Yes since anyone can suggest someone to serve.

Q: Are the stated ex officio members appropriate for the work of the committee, i.e. does each person provide the contribution that the committee needs to do its work? Are there other ex officio members that should be added to the committee?

A: The only ex officio member is from the Twin Cities. It might be useful to have system campus members as well.

Q: Is this committee consulted on the appropriate Regents and Administrative policies (refer to policy matrix)?

A: The committee has been involved in policy issues that related to its charge, such as the discussion with the Educational Policy Committee regarding a special 'F' grade for scholastic dishonesty and the plagiarism definition in the Student Conduct Code.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

A member asked if instructors are notified when a student withdraws in case they are accused of scholastic dishonesty. Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn noted that this committee worked with Academic Support Resources a few years ago to make sure that instructors receive an email each week letting them know that students have withdrawn from their course in case they are being accused of scholastic dishonesty. The One-stop form for students has also been changed to let the student know that they could be re-enrolled if they are withdrawing to avoid a charge of scholastic dishonesty.

With no further business, Jennifer Goodnough thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate