

[In these minutes: OSCAI Updates, Year-end business]

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

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2009**

[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), Lisa Anderson, Sarah Angerman, Dana Davis, Sharon Dzik, Laura Coffin Koch, Chris Russill, Eric Watkins.

**REGRETS:** Linda Jones.

**ABSENT:** Manami Bhattacharya, Erin West.

### **1. OSCAI STATUS REPORT AND UPDATES**

Sharon Dzik reported that she has spoken with Donald McCabe, an academic integrity researcher from Rutgers, about redoing the Minnesota survey that was completed in spring 2004. Additionally, her office, with Indiana University, will be doing a survey of professional schools to determine what is considered in their admissions process. She would also like to survey faculty to see their reasons for not reporting violations.

Laura Coffin Koch noted that at a recent CIC undergraduate education meeting, faculty reporting was discussed. Other institutions stated that their cases are all handled at the college level, which has improved reporting.

Sharon Dzik said that it would be hard for the University's colleges to take ownership of this process.

Tom Shield said that a central hearing body is also better than hearings held within each college.

Regarding the McCabe survey, members made the following comments:

- Questions from last time need to be reviewed
- Data will be used to inform faculty
- Faculty perceptions will be important to glean
- Talks will need to take place with Institutional Research regarding scheduling and the sample

Work on this survey will be a top item for fall.

### **2. YEAR-END BUSINESS**

## WITHDRAWALS

Tom Shield said that only CLA and IT have a policy preventing students from withdrawing from a class when a report of scholastic dishonesty is pending. Should this policy be extended to all undergraduates?

Members made the following comments:

- Students should not be prevented from withdrawing since this can create financial issues
- Withdrawals should not be processed while a charge is pending, but if a student is found not responsible, then the withdrawal could be dated to when it was originally filed by the student.
- Timing is an issue since some students will stop attending class because they believe that they have withdrawn
- There must be a way, in PeopleSoft, to create a service indicator regarding withdrawals
- PeopleSoft could be configured to trigger an automatic email regarding reinstatements due to scholastic dishonesty to students when they withdraw from a course
- Timely reporting by faculty is still an issue
- PeopleSoft could also be configured to email faculty when any student withdraws from a class after the second week. This would be helpful for faculty in all cases, not just when they are reporting scholastic dishonesty

Language on this change will be brought to the September meeting.

## TEACHING AND LEARNING: INSTRUCTOR AND UNIT RESPONSIBILITIES

Tom Shield stated that the committee's suggested change to policy have been forwarded to the Educational Policy Committee for action.

## DISCIPLINARY BACKGROUND CHECKS

Tom Shield said that this will continue to be an issue for next year.

## PROFESSIONALS SCHOOLS

Professionals schools will be invited to attend meetings next year to explain their scholastic dishonesty process. The Medical School's policy is currently under revision.

## **3. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

Becky Hippert  
University Senate