Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)
September 11, 2019
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:** Overview of the University Senate Governance Structure and Committee Charge; Academic Integrity - Plagiarism Module Update; Discussion on Outstanding Resolution and Statement; Solicit Ideas and Topics from Committee Members for the Year]

PRESENT: Jeffrey Schott (chair), Kenneth Leopold, Susan O'Conner-Von, Bibhudetta Panda, Peter Haeg, Sara Johnson, Tracene Marshall, Caitlin Federici, Aditya Pakki, Caroline Bender, Sharon Dzik, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn

REGRETS: Daniela Orza,

ABSENT: Jace Leabo, Nicholas Fleege

GUESTS: Lindsay Matts-Benson, instructional designer, University of Minnesota Libraries

OTHERS: Katie Koopmeiners

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

1. Overview of the University Senate Governance Structure and Committee Charge - Schott introduced Chris Kwapick, senate associate, University Senate Office, to give an overview of the University's Senate governance structure. Kwapick stated that the University of Minnesota is considered to have one of the strongest and most active shared governance systems among large research universities and has a successful collaborative working relationship with both the administration and the Board of Regents. The shared governance system is established in the University Senate Constitution.

The University Senate was established in 1912 and the first meeting included only members of the faculty. That changed in 1969 when students were given representation in the senate. The senate was further expanded to include faculty-like academic professionals in 1993 and P&A and civil service staff in 2004. To be clear, not all employees currently have representation on the University Senate. Due to restrictions imposed by federal and state labor law, unionized staff and the faculties who have voted for collective bargaining (Crookston and those at Duluth except the Medical/Pharmacy schools) do not participate in the governance system.

Kwapick then presented an organizational chart of the entire University Senate structure which includes four different senates for faculty, students, P&A and civil service staff. Each senate has what is known as a consultative committee which acts as the senate's executive body. They are

charged with oversight and planning of their respective senates. Each senate also has a number of committees and subcommittees that report to them. There are currently 22 standing committees and 14 subcommittees or working groups within the senate structure. Over 1,000 individuals make up the entire senate governance structure. Each committee has a charge which outlines its memberships and responsibilities.

The responsibilities of the senate are as follows:
- Has legislative authority over all general matters that affect the University as a whole.
- Acts as an advisory and consultative body to the president on any matter that may affect the achievement of the missions of the University.
- Has the responsibility to recommend to the president regulations for the governing of faculty, academic professionals, civil service employees, and students.

There are three types of legislative actions that a committee or senate can take: a statement, a letter, or a resolution. A statement describes the committee's position on an issue. It is then forwarded to the appropriate consultative committee for information and then shared with the appropriate senate for information. A letter may outline a committee's position on an issue and may or may not request action to be taken. Letters are sent to the appropriate senior administrator and the issue can be resolved without any further action. Letters to administrators are shared with the appropriate senate. A resolution calls for action. After a resolution is drafted, a committee votes on it and, if approved, it is forwarded to the appropriate consultative committee for consideration to be placed on the docket/agenda of the appropriate senate for a vote. If approved by a senate, it is then forwarded to the Office of the President.

Kwapick then gave a brief overview of the Student Academic Integrity Committee's charge. He highlighted the duties and responsibilities of the committee.

2. Academic Integrity - Plagiarism Module Update - Schott introduced Lindsay Matts-Benson, instructional designer, University of Minnesota Libraries, to provide the committee with an update on a Canvas module that looks to address scholastic dishonesty. Matts-Benson said that she has been working with a group of people to discuss and design a possible module for students to take upon their matriculation at the University. She stated that the group's goal was to have less students deal with issues around academic integrity, particularly plagiarism. After discussing the issues they were aware of, the group has continued to develop a plan forward for creating a module that would include information, case studies, assessments, and reflection pieces.

Matts-Benson continued by stating that some of the challenges with the module include making sure it isn't punitive in nature. The goal is to have an emphasis on learning and understanding academic integrity rather than just sending a message of "don't cheat or plagiarize." She identified three essential areas to build upon right away. They include identifying definitions around academic integrity, using sources in your work and the University, and successful collaboration. The module would have a pre-test in order to assess prior knowledge and create a baseline for learning and values. Then, by working through some case studies, the individual would be able to have self-reflection about the material. The idea is to make it as much of a

scholarly conversation as possible. Additionally, the module would provide resources to the user when appropriately prompted.

Caitlin Federici asked if the intent of the module is to be proactive, reactive, or both. Matts-Benson said that ideally it would be both. Federici then asked when students would take this module as it sounds time consuming. Matts-Benson said that perhaps it would only be taken as a freshman and a different version would be made for graduate students due to a different set of skills and stakes.

Ken Leopold commented that it might be beneficial including this information in the various freshman experience courses and then utilizing this module sophomore year in order provide more frequent contact. Sharon Dzik applauded the work being done with the module. Schott commented that he agrees this is a great start and likes the mix of proactive and reactive approaches.

Tracene Marshall asked if the module could be launched as a type of pilot program. Matts-Benson said that yes, she works closely with multiple colleagues to provide small group tests.

3. Discussion on Outstanding Resolution and Statement - Schott introduced the following resolution Requiring Academic Integrity Education, which aims to encourage the University of Minnesota to implement required academic development modules regarding academic integrity for all University instructing faculty and students upon their matriculation. Based upon recent discussions, the thought was that there would be one training for students, one training for faculty, and another for others such as international students. Leopold said that he was concerned about the term "required" training, and suggested that the word be changed to "appropriate." The committee agreed and Kwapick said he would incorporate that change. Sara Johnson commented that it would be important to frame this in terms of faculty development as opposed to required training. Susan O'Conner-Von added that this is very important for new faculty.

Peter Haeg suggested that the language of the resolution be a little less on the punitive side and include more about being a community of shared values. Dzik added that it should also differentiate between student and faculty expectations. Federici commented that it is important for faculty to understand the importance of reporting student misconduct. Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn said it might be beneficial to tie completion of the module to financial wellness. Schott said that more edits will be made to the resolution and be brought back for a vote at the next meeting.

Schott then introduced the following statement on Common Issues and Best Practices in Academic Integrity and gave an overview. He stated that the statement was the result of many of the responses from last year's college reviews. The idea is to provide the University community with an overview of common issues and best practices related to academic integrity. He then asked for committee members to comment on the statement with the understanding that this can be an evolving document.

Dzik commented that it is important that faculty understand some of the new means of technology that students may use for cheating, including websites where students can upload their work. Grotjohn suggested adding a link to the administrative policy "Teaching and Learning: Student Responsibilities," which states, "Students may not distribute instructor-provided notes or other course materials, except to other members of the same class or with the express (written) consent of the instructor. Instructors have the right to impose additional restrictions on course materials in accordance with copyright and intellectual property law and policy. Students may not engage in the widespread distribution or sale of transcript-like notes or notes that are close to verbatim records of a lecture or presentation." Additionally, Gotjohn noted that in the recommended policy statement for syllabi, broadly disseminating class notes beyond the classroom community or accepting compensation for taking and distributing classroom notes undermines instructor interests in their intellectual work product while not substantially furthering instructor and student interests in effective learning. Such actions violate shared norms and standards of the academic community. Kwapick said he would add a link to that policy in the statement.

Federici added that it can be confusing if it is a student's own work or intellectual property. Bibhudetta Panda asked how people have dealt with answer banks online. Schott said that if a textbook has questions, the answers will be available somewhere. It is up to faculty to use caution. Johnson suggested adding mental health resources to the resources section of the statement as often times it can be stress or anxiety that causes a student to cheat.

4. Solicit Ideas and Topics from Committee Members for the Year - Schott then asked committee members if they had topics they wished to discuss for the year and the answers were as follows:
- Dzik said she would like to discuss contract cheating where students pay third parties to do their work for them. Panda noted this was highlighted by the following New York Times article: https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/07/us/college-cheating-papers.html?nl=todaysheadlines&emc=edit_th_190908?campaign_id=2&instance_id=12073&segment_id=16839&user_id=4aff0353cb97e25fe46dba2065bea027&regi_id=186815590908
- Federici would like to have further discussion around a student's original academic work and academic freedom.
- Haeg suggested hearing from other peer institutions about how to build and maintain an ethical community.
- Aditya Pakki suggested discussing a statute of limitations on students for uploading their work and if there is University policy that addresses that.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office