

[In these minutes: Recap of 2003-04 and summer committee business, Next steps with survey information]

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

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 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), Shawn Curley, Marilyn Grave, Paul Myers, Robert Pepin.

**REGRETS:** Dorothy Anderson, Lizette Barthodhi, Laura Coffin Koch.

**ABSENT:** Sharon Dzik, Kirsten Rewey.

### **1. RECAP OF 2003-04 AND SUMMER COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND NEXT STEPS WITH SURVEY INFORMATION**

Micky Trent reminded committee members that the University participated in a survey of faculty and students last spring on the topic of student academic integrity. The results have been compiled by Donald McCabe, head of the Duke Center for Academic Integrity, and show a breakdown by undergraduate, graduate/professional, and faculty, with a comparison to the national data. The committee met once over the summer to review the data, determine what differences exist at Minnesota, and considers what the committee needs to do next.

Members then made the following comments regarding the data:

- University compared favorably with the rest of the institutions in the survey
- Minnesota students are better informed than the faculty perceive
- Are students receiving information from another source besides faculty?
- From results it is hard to tell how well faculty are educated
- Faculty are more willing to fail a student than report them
- There were more older faculty in the University sample
- There is low interest in a University-wide honor code, either from students or faculty
- Both here and nationally, there is a low percentage of students who report other students for cheating
- Faculty have a low reporting rate to OSAI
- OSAI is not recognized as an information source by faculty

- When graduate/professional students report seeing cheating, it is unclear if the cheating is among their peers or undergraduates
- Results do not say if students perceive a threat with an honor code
- Faculty seem to need education on what OSAI does; some feel that there is no need to report if they have already decided on the sanction
- Some faculty feel that the decision is out of their hands once it is reported to OSAI

The committee would like the following information from Donald McCabe:

- More faculty breakdown for age (age 40 or less, age above 40)
- More student breakdown for age (age 20 or less, 20-25, and age above 25)
- Student year in program (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and above)
- Honor code v. non-honor code
- Divide comments between undergraduate v. graduate v. professional students

Next steps for the committee and the survey should include:

- Work on ease of reporting cases to OSAI
- Investigate why faculty do not report to OSAI, and if they are reporting somewhere else, is the information being coordinated
- Marketing information from OSAI
- Investigate why there is a low student response rate for reporting violations in honor code schools
- Is there an relationship for faculty between reporting and age?
- Why did some programs have a low response rate?
- Consider focus groups to answer some questions
- Who else should receive a summary of data ? Council of Undergraduate Deans, Council of Graduate Deans, Senate Consultative Committee, Educational Policy Committee
- What other questions need to be asked of students and faculty?

The committee then discussed the best way to inform faculty about academic integrity:

- Get procedures fixed and in place first
- Web site should include two forms: one if the faculty has already assigned a sanction and a second if the faculty wants help from OSAI
- OSAI forms should be able to be completed and submitted via the web
- Start with faculty who have been at the University longer
- Faculty need to know what to do
- At Crookston, faculty call Academic Affairs but they and the other faculty do not hear what happens; only the academic advisor knows
- At Morris, the policy is distributed to students so that they understand when a penalty is assessed; there is no reporting mechanism

- Faculty member at Crookston used software to catch cheaters, but the students grieved because of the age of the software
- OSAI should publish guidelines on typical sanctions to be imposed depending on the type of violation

### **3. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

Becky Hippert  
University Senate