

**Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)**  
**February 7, 2018**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**

*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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.*

[**In these minutes:** Policy Review: [Resolving Alleged Student Conduct Code Violations](#); Update on IACI Survey; Solicitation of Future Agenda Items from Committee Members; Discussion of the Disability Resource Center's (DRC) Role and Accountability in Scholastic Dishonesty]

**PRESENT:** Jeffrey Schott (chair), Kimberly Clark, Sara Johnson, Tracene Marshall, Mark Bultmann, Sharon Dzik, John Hourdos, Rashne Jehangir, Nicholas Fleege, Aditya Pakki

**REGRETS:** Barry McQuarrie, Bethany Novak

**ABSENT:** Daniela Orza

**GUESTS:** Scott Marshall, associate director, Disability Resource Center

**OTHERS:** Amber Bathke, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn

Chair Jeffrey Schott welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves.

**1. Policy Review:** [Resolving Alleged Student Conduct Code Violations](#) - Schott introduced Sharon Dzik, director, Office for Community Standards. Dzik explained that it is the practice that the SAIC review this policy periodically. The policy applies to all campuses and Dzik is having multiple meetings with all campuses to discuss the policy. She asked the committee to review the policy over the next few weeks and make recommendations for changes by the March 7, 2018 meeting. The committee will be asked to vote to approve the policy changes at the next meeting. She said she will be sending out a marked-up red line version of the policy in the next week for members to review via Google docs.

Rashne Jehangir asked if this was the same Board of Regents policy on the Student Code of Conduct that has recently been reviewed and discussed system-wide. Dzik responded that this is not that policy, this is an administrative policy. She added that one change to already note is a language change on the first page, changing "accused student" to "respondent" and "reporting party" to "complainant" to match other policies on campus.

Schott reiterated that members should submit their suggestions/comments by email over the next month and the committee will vote on it at the March 7, 2018 meeting. Jehangir asked if it was possible to see previous revisions of the policy from 2014. Dzik responded that she would add that. Schott then asked if there were substantive changes that Dzik has already identified. Dzik responded not yet but it is still in the review phase.

Tracene Marshall asked for some clarification about how this policy applies to the process of cases of misconduct going to the Office for Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA). Dzik clarified that while that process is different from this particular policy, it is the same language that she intends to match within this policy.

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn added that EOAA is the investigative body for misconduct and it would then go to the Office for Community Standards (OCS) for possible sanctions. A formal hearing would then be sent to the University Senate Office and heard by either the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB) or the Student Sexual Misconduct Subcommittee (SSMS).

**2. Update on International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) Survey** - Dzik noted that she would send the committee a link to the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) survey. She said she is working with the proper authorities on campus to determine the proper time to send the survey to students. She has made some suggested changes to the survey already and has taken out portions that don't apply to the University of Minnesota. She will send out a red line version to the committee and solicit suggestions for possible additional questions for both faculty and students. Schott asked that members have it complete by the next meeting if possible. Dzik asked members to think about how it applies directly to the University of Minnesota and make it as specific as possible.

Sara Johnson asked about the overall purpose of the survey. Dzik said it was to gauge student and faculty awareness of policies and if cases of academic dishonesty are being reported properly.

Tracene Marshall suggested that Dzik highlight areas of interest the committee should focus on as well as the goals of the survey. Tracene Marshall then asked what the students thought about the timeline. Aditya Pakki said a smaller survey is fine to send out at any point during the semester. However, a longer survey should be conducted earlier in the academic year, perhaps during orientation. Dzik said it would go to about 2000 recipients and be exclusive to the Twin Cities campus. Nicholas Fleege suggested that the survey not be sent to students during the time surrounding finals or any long break. Dzik asked Fleege if Duluth would be interested in using the survey. Fleege said he would run it by the appropriate channels and get back to Dzik at a later time. Dzik said she hopes to have the links to committee members by next week as well.

**3. Solicitation of future agenda items from committee members** - Schott opened the floor to suggestions for future topics that the committee ought to address. Responses were as follows:

- Schott mentioned the "Gopher Original" campaign that was discussed in September. He asked if this idea should be brought up for future consideration. Johnson noted that previous committee discussions had included feedback that additional work was needed on the campaign and it was not ready for implementation. Grotjohn suggested that more focus groups would be necessary before moving forward on this initiative. The committee agreed to not work on this issue and try to focus more on Academic Integrity Week that occurs in September.

- Schott asked about funding for initiatives. He noted that unless the committee knows what it is asking for, then simply asking for money doesn't go very far. Dzik suggested that once the ICAI survey is complete, the committee would have a better sense about what to fund and what initiatives to focus on.
- John Houdos asked about the reporting of academic misconduct and if there was an update on resources for faculty regarding sources that assist students in cheating. Examples include websites that sell homework and exams. He said he became aware of them from a simple Google search and faculty should be made aware of these dangers. He asked if it is the committee's responsibility for educating faculty about these sources so they can make adjustments to assignments and exams. Dzik responded that the Center for Educational Innovation is the best place for faculty to obtain this information. Houdos understood, but noted that the title of that office is confusing and he had no idea that was the appropriate source. He noted that strategies exist for faculty and they need the resources to be made aware of them to keep some answers private.
- Schott suggested reviewing the committee charge to make sure it is accurately and provides proper guidance. He asked members to review the charge on the committee website before the next committee and suggest any possible changes. Houdos asked to move it into a Google Doc so everyone can edit it at the same time and Schott agreed that that was a good idea.
- Schott asked about gathering academic data to see if there is any implicit bias in the reporting of academic dishonesty. Dzik said that this has already been completed by OCS and said that she would be happy to share it with the committee, however, the results suggested that there was not much compelling data. Schott still suggested that it would be good for the committee to review the data anyway.
- Johnson mentioned targeting faculty starting in March for Academic Integrity Week so they can integrate some of its goals into their syllabi for the following academic year. Dzik said her office has started on that initiative and can show the progress they have made at a later meeting.

**4. Discussion of the Disability Resource Center's (DRC) role and accountability in scholastic dishonesty** - Schott introduced Scott Marshall, associate director, Disability Resource Center (DRC). Marshall said his role is to oversee the testing center which conducts over 12,000 exams per year. The numbers of exams they administer is growing every year. He noted that last fall the DRC had a few incidents of students doing inappropriate things during exams and the DRC would like some clarification about how they should be reporting such instances. He said that the DRC's role for exam preparation should be clarified in order to maintain exam integrity. Essentially, the DRC wants to know what its role should be when a student cheats. The DRC views itself as an extension of the instructor.

Scott Marshall continued with an overview of the services the DRC provides to students with disabilities, which include reduced distraction environments, semi-private rooms with proctors, and some fully private rooms that do not have proctors. He said the DRC will never be able to stop 100% of cheating that occurs, but when it does, what is their role? Should the center be only reporting to the professor or should it be directly reporting to the appropriate University offices?

Currently, the center's procedure is to stop the exam and notify the professor. The goal is to minimize the risk of lowering the DRC's integrity and maintaining a good reputation.

Jehangir noted that not all faculty report instances of academic misconduct to the University and thinks that there needs to be collective ownership in this process.

Tracene Marshall asked if it is inappropriate to monitor private rooms electronically. Doing so would provide private space but allow a proctor to still supervise. Scott Marshall responded they are currently exploring those options.

Hourdos asked about the process by which a student justifies their requirement for this sort of accommodation. Scott Marshall explained that when they enter the U they disclose a diagnosis from a healthcare professional that they need this service. At that point it becomes an interactive process. The DRC writes an accommodation letter, gives the letter to the student, and the student gives it to professor. Hourdos said that doesn't always happen, he sometimes gets the letter from the DRC with no explanation from the student.

Schott noted that several of his students use the DRC, usually for extended time, and it works great. He thinks the process for setting requirements for the exam works well and if the student strays from those requirements, that is when a problem can occur. He thought that cameras were a good idea as they can also provide proof of evidence if cheating were to occur.

Hourdos expressed concerns that some students may take advantage of the DRC and its system and it may be why the use of the center has grown so rapidly. Mark Bultmann disagreed due to the fact that there is a tremendous increase in demand for mental health services on campus which leads to a lot of the DRC's use. It requires a lot of resources to be declared to have a disability to use the center.

Tracene Marshall noted she used to be a disability coordinator and the process needs to be collaborative in nature. Students need to have some accountability and they need to communicate with their instructor so that part of the ownership falls to the student as well. Jehangir asked about how to frame this as a partnership. Students aren't always encouraged within the class to interact with their instructor about it or it could be uncomfortable for the student. Those expectations need to be made clear and not just in a policy or code. Some sort of basic needs statements within the syllabus could be possible. Dzik and Tracene Marshall agreed with this notion.

Dzik asked a hypothetical question about what happens when the DRC discovers an issue of misconduct, the center reports it to the professor, and the professor doesn't report it to the University. Should the DRC then report the incident to the University directly? Does the faculty have "veto" power about reporting to the University? She feels that the DRC needs to know what the proper process is. Scott Marshall said that currently the DRC documents what happened and reports it to both the instructor and the University, specifically OCS, who can decide to issue a sanction to the student. Hourdos said that he does not prefer this method. His preference would be the DRC reports to the instructor only and that the decision would then fall to the instructor

about what to do next. In his case, he would fail the student but not report to OCS. He doesn't think it should fall into the student's record. Jehangir disagreed and thought the DRC should be required to report to OCS because the DRC are comprised of the individuals who directly observed the action.

Grotjohn inquired if students agree to terms and conditions when they go to the DRC? Scott Marshall replied that yes, every student has to click through a series of iPad screens and questions. The process provides the outline for what is and isn't permitted for the exam and they sign an academic integrity form. Grotjohn added that typically decisions regarding scholastic integrity fall to the instructors, but since the student is agreeing to all these rules and procedures prior to the test, it should be considered a violation of University rules and the student should be held responsible.

Tracene Marshall noted she is aware that there are many instructors who handle these issues internally without notifying the University, while others will notify OCS everytime. That means there are faculty on both sides of this issue and she felt that other committees with that include more faculty should weigh in on this subject. Johnson agreed and noted that the reputation of the center is vitally important.

Dzik opined that if the DRC witnesses cheating, it should be reported to the OCS in one of two ways. One option is the case gets reported to OCS and then they check in with faculty to ask what in their opinion a sanction should be. The second option would be for the DRC to report directly to faculty, but then runs the risk of the faculty not reporting to OCS, which in her opinion is improper. She said it is an obligation to report cheating. Hourdos clarified that if the DRC were to report to the OCS and not act until the faculty approves, that would be an acceptable situation. However, he would prefer that a case or file not be opened or maintained by OCS unless it is approved by the faculty member due to privacy concerns and the risk to the student's reputation.

Fleeger noted that he personally has a hard line on cheating and feels it should always be reported because it disadvantages all honest students. Pakki disagreed, noting a human element always comes into play. He feels that going straight to OCS could be problematic and harsh on the student. Every case should be treated equally. Grotjohn added that to cheat in the DRC takes premeditation. This isn't a situation where a student panics and looks at their neighbor's work, it takes planning. Because of that premeditation and the aforementioned terms and conditions that the student agrees to, she thinks the DRC should be reporting to OCS directly.

Dzik suggested that an overview of how scholastic dishonesty is handled would be beneficial to the committee at a future meeting. Informing the committee about student redevelopment and how those programs work can help gain a better understanding of how this process works. Tracene Marshall agreed but urged that the committee not miss the point that a student in the DRC should have the same equity as non-DRC students in that class where if an instructor wouldn't report the average student for cheating, that the DRC student would be afforded the same privilege. Jehangir agreed that a review would be helpful.

Bultmann said the DRC at a minimum needs to report these types of cases to the instructor in order to maintain the integrity of center. Hourdos agreed because the instructor can then use the report from the DRC (a credible University source) to forward to OCS if they wish to do so. Scott Marshall indicated his reservations about not reporting to OCS directly because some instructors won't forward the report on to OCS. He said that the DRC will continue its practice of reporting to both OCS and the instructor but would welcome more input from faculty.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick  
University Senate Office