

[In these minutes: Scholastic Dishonesty violations within the Dental School, Communication to Faculty]

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

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2010**

[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:** Tom Shield (Chair), Levi Atinda, Dana Davis, Sharon Dzik, Patricia Fillipi, Jennifer Goodnough, Kendall King, Francisco Ocampo, Andrew Olson.

**REGRETS:** Sarah Angerman, Arthur Carlson, Laura Coffin Koch, Eric Watkins.

**GUESTS:** Sarah Johnson, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF SCHOLSTIC DISHONESTY ALLEGATIONS HANDLED WITHIN THE DENTAL SCHOOL**

Sara Johnson, Director of Student Services in the Dental School, referred to section 3 of the Dental School Code, which provides the procedures for handling scholastic dishonesty cases. The Code has five sections. It is available on the web and is provided to all students during orientation.

She said that in Fall 2009 a committee was appointed to review the procedure and see what could be done differently. The committee was composed of four faculty, one as chair, and three students. They looked at other dental school codes as well as other professional schools codes at the University and other institutions, interviewed key stakeholders, and spoke with the Office of the General Counsel.

The committee made recommendations for changes in four areas:

1. A pool should be created to populate the School's ethics committee, education committee, and hearing boards
2. The code of conduct officer for ethics violations should be housed outside the administrative offices, provide a yearly report, and talk with each class regarding ethics. The faculty in this position would be appointed by the dean.
3. Some violations would automatically go to a hearing and not have an informal step
4. The school presenter/informant would serve as the advocate for the student who reports a violation

These changes are pending approval by the Student Affairs Committee in December. Previously there was more flexibility for cheating allegations but now all are sent to the code of conduct officer for consistency.

She also noted that each incoming class is asked to write a code of ethics after talking with the previous class. There are consistent themes through the year with new variations. This code does not outline any sanctions.

Tom Shield noted that the policy does not state that OSCAI should be notified, but this is a requirement of the University Policy on Student Records.

Sara Johnson said that since the procedure has not yet been approved, this requirement can be added.

Q: How is faculty compliance with reporting?

A: Compliance is getting better as the issue is discussed more with the faculty.

Sara Johnson said that she would welcome any other feedback.

## **2. OSCAI UPDATE**

Sharon Dzik stated that she is just starting work on the OSCAI annual report. There were 189 scholastic dishonesty cases last year which is an increase from the previous year.

## **3. REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION TO FACULTY**

Tom Shield presented the idea for two faculty emails. The first was a once per semester email to faculty regarding scholastic dishonesty and OSCAI. The second was an email to faculty when a student withdraws from a class for any reason, therefore providing notice to the faculty if a student tries to withdraw when accused of scholastic dishonesty. Members agreed that these emails would be useful to all faculty and the issues should be pursued. Tom Shield said that he would bring drafts to the next meeting.

## **4. OTHER BUSINESS**

With no further business, Tom Shield thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert  
University Senate