

[In these minutes: OSAI Update, Grading Policy and Academic Dishonesty, Survey Action Plan]

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)

MINUTES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2004

1:30 – 3:00 PM

300 MORRILL HALL

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view of, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Micky Trent (Chair), Lizette Barthodhi, Shawn Curley, Sharon Dzik, Marilyn Grave, Derek Johnson, Meghan Keil, Laura Coffin Koch, Paul Myers, Robert Pepin, David Sullivan-Nightengale.

REGRETS: Dorothy Anderson, Jeremy Deitz.

1. OSAI UPDATE

Sharon Dzik reported that the first training session for the six Student Advocates for Academic Integrity was held on November 20. Another session is being scheduled at which time the advocates will be taught three practice modules that they can use when talking in classes. The advocates will participate in an event with First Year Programs at the start of spring semester and should be ready to do classroom programs in February.

She also noted that her office has been busy with some cases that have come forward, but she expects more in the next few weeks as classes come to an end.

Q: Have the number of cases remained constant?

A: It appears that there has been some decrease, due to the fact that there is less time to meet with colleges and departments to drum up business. The office is also looking for one or two more people, as Meredith McGrath is leaving and Sharon Dzik is still hoping for another person to help with OSAI.

2. GRADING POLICY AND ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Sharon Dzik noted that she has received several cases from one department in which the instructors have noted that they have to assign an 'F' grade for the class for cheating based on the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy. She asked if this language could be changed.

Several members noted that the language was intended to read that the instructor has the

authority to give an 'F' in the class for cheating, but not that this grade is required. If instructors are reading the language as a mandate instead of guidance, the Educational Policy Committee should be asked to re-examine the language and issue an interpretation.

Sharon Dzik inquired whether it might be more useful to delete the current language in the policy and replace it with what OSAI states, "Within this course, a student responsible for scholastic dishonesty can be assigned a penalty up to and including an "F" or "N" for the course. If you have any questions regarding the expectations for a specific assignment or exam, ask the Office for Student Academic Integrity." The committee supported requesting that this language change be made.

3. REVIEW OF UPDATED SURVEY RESULTS AND ACTION PLAN

Micky Trent provided new members with background on the survey process, noting that the national survey was chosen to give the University comparison with other institutions and get some baseline information about the local environment for academic dishonesty.

She noted that some of the members met once this summer and discussed general thoughts about the data and what other information was needed. Most of the other information has been received, except for the total number of responses by question and a separation by honor code and non-honor code schools.

The committee then discussed what to do with the results:

- Report results to Educational Policy Committee, University Senate, Senate Consultative Committee, Dean's Councils
- Presentations should focus on national comparisons and areas of further focus
- Focus groups would be with schools and populations that are doing well and those who are at risk
- Focus group questions would be focused to answer why questions raised by the survey
- Work on how to better incorporate academic honesty into the culture for all groups
- Figure out what is wrong with the present system and ways to fix it

Members then noted which survey details they found interesting:

- Students seem to receive more information on academic integrity that faculty perceive to be providing
- Faculty do not appear to get as much useful information from OSAI as the committee would like
- Faculty age seems to have an impact
- Honor code schools did not have a great response rate
- Neither faculty or students believe that it is the students' job to be responsible for academic integrity in the classroom
- Student and faculty comments might answer some questions
- Students seem more willing to cheat in courses that are not in their major

Micky Trent said that she would like to have a discussion at the next meeting as what to do next. She asked all members to review the data that has been sent and let her know other details to pull from the data. She will compile the results from the members and have a sheet detailing points of interest out to members by the end of the first week in January. The committee will finalize the presentation in January and then be ready to present to groups spring semester.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, Micky Trent thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate