

[In these minutes: OSCAI draft survey]

## **STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE (SAIC)**

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2013**

[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:** Dana Davis (Chair), Bradley Conley, Sharon Dzik, Jennifer Goodnough, Stacy Ingraham, Laura Coffin Koch, Susan LoRusso, Francisco Ocampo, LeAnn Snow.

**REGRETS:** Arthur Erdman, Patricia Fillipi, Michael Luetmer, Russell Martin.

**GUESTS:** Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Jessica Schuett.

### **1. OSCAI UPDATES**

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn distributed the form that is used by OSCAI for faculty to report violations. Descriptions have been added to some of the sections to assist faculty with what information should be included. She asked members to review the form and send her any additional feedback.

She then distributed two brochures that OSCAI developed for speaking with students about the OSCAI process and academic integrity. She asked for feedback on these materials as well. Members made the following comments:

- Distribution to students can take place at Welcome Week, but can also happen at the SMART Learning Commons, libraries, advisor offices, freshmen seminar instructors
- Restorative justice should be included in the OSCAI process information; work is being done to determine how this process could work for scholastic dishonesty cases

Sharon Dzik then noted that the semester email from Provost Hanson to faculty on reporting violations received some negative feedback this semester from faculty who have been through a hearing and are frustrated by this process. A member suggested that OSCAI should collect quotes from faculty who have been through the process and were satisfied with the outcome to use when speaking with faculty and to combat negative comments.

### **2. OSCAI DRAFT SURVEY FOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS**

Sharon Dzik explained that OSCAI plans to survey faculty who have reported, faculty who have not reported, associate deans, department heads/chairs, director of undergraduate studies (DUGS), and director of graduate studies (DGS). The information being collected will be distinct from the data collected on the McCabe survey.

Jessica Schuett from Measurement Services noted that the surveys are still in a rough draft, so committee feedback would be valuable at this time. She then walked members through each survey.

#### Survey 1

Goals: goal a corresponds to questions 1-6, goal b corresponds to questions 7-13

Members made the following comments:

- Questions should focus on actions, such as speaking to another faculty or staff member
- Ask question to see to whom they refer faculty who have a suspected violation
- Scholastic dishonesty and academic integrity are not interchangeable and need to be kept consistent throughout the survey
- Questions 12, 13, and 17 should be agree/disagree rather than true/false
- Questions 5 and 6 should be reworded to appear less judgmental
- All acronyms need to be explained
- Question 16a should address factors that influence the likelihood or not of reporting
- Add question regarding what information respondents would like to have, such as a direct report, copies of the report, copies of all letters from OSCAI, etc.

### Survey 2

Goals: goal a corresponds to questions 1-16, goal b corresponds to questions 11-13 and 18-19, goal c corresponds to questions 20-22

Members made the following comments:

- Question 6 should be separated into two parts
- Inception date of OSCAI should be added for reference
- Question on what to do when encountering scholastic dishonesty should be added to the first group of questions so that all respondents provide answers, not just those who complete the full survey
- Even if a respondent answers 'no' to questions 1 and 2, questions 11-22 should still apply and be asked
- Add a question, similar to 11, but in reference to explaining scholastic dishonesty to students in the context of a course
- Question 9 is two separate questions
- Proposed question applies to more than one college and should be rewritten to be asked of everyone
- Use survey to talk about how few cases go to a hearing
- Question 4 should refer to just the report, not the follow-up which can vary
- Add a question on accountability to peers

### Survey 3

Goals: goal a corresponds to questions 1-4, goal b corresponds to questions 8-20, goal c corresponds to questions 21-23, goal d corresponds to questions 24-26

Members made the following comments:

- Question 2 should have a more definite time frame, such as 'the next time you suspect a violation of scholastic dishonesty'
- Organize a section of questions for cases that did go to a hearing
- Question focus should be process versus outcome
- Tone for all questions should be switched to positive or neutral, such as 'short and easy process' and 'reasonable time to complete'
- Questions 8-12 assess the value in reporting and whether a faculty member would report again
- Question 18 could be focused on academic integrity or accountability to the department and peers for reporting
- Add a question regarding perception if the faculty member reports more or less than peers and then why

## **3. OTHER BUSINESS**

With no further business, Dana Davis thanked the members for their service this year and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert  
University Senate