

**Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)
February 13, 2019
Minutes of the Meeting**

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** College Review - University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) - College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP); College Review - Carlson School of Management (CSOM); Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB) Procedure Amendment; Discussion on Academic Integrity Canvass Module for Students upon Matriculation]

PRESENT: Jeffrey Schott (chair), Pieranna Garavaso, John Hourdos, Tracene Marshall, Caitlin Federici, Sharon Dzik, Kathrine Russell

REGRETS: Rashne Jehangir, Daniela Orza, Kimberly Clarke, Sara Johnson, Nicholas Fleege

ABSENT: Aditya Pakki, Jace Leabo

GUESTS: Scott R. Carlson, associate dean, UMD College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP); Raj Singh, associate dean for the undergraduate program, Carlson School of Management (CSOM)

OTHERS: Katie Koopmeiners

Chair Jeffrey Schott welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves. Sharon Dzik introduced Katie Koopmeiners, the new associate director for the Office for Community Standards who will be working closely on academic integrity cases and the Academic Integrity Matters (AIM) program. Dzik and Koopmeiners said that they recently returned from Florida and a student conduct administrators conference which they found very enlightening.

1. College Review - University of Minnesota Duluth - College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP) - Schott introduced Scott R. Carlson, associate dean, College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP), to provide a review of academic integrity at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) CEHSP. He stated that CEHSP is one of five colleges at UMD and has five academic departments with 13 undergraduate programs and six graduate programs. Average enrollment in CEHSP each year is about 2,191 students, which makes it the second largest college at UMD. Carlson stated that he has been in the position of associate dean for about six months and had previously served as the department head of the Department of Psychology. As associate dean, he said he deals directly with student issues.

Carlson continued by stating that academic integrity issues are handled in a centralized way on the UMD campus through the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution, which reports

to the vice chancellor of Student Life. The director of the office is Dr. Katie Jackson. Once a report of academic dishonesty is submitted by a faculty member, the office performs an investigation, usually led by the department head of the reporting faculty. If the student contests the department head's investigative report, the associate dean of the college is then involved in the situation. So Carlson is only made aware of academic dishonesty cases if they are brought to that level. Carlson said that according to Jackson, who tracks all cases of academic dishonesty, CEHSP had 61 instances of academic dishonesty in the past year. This is a bit of an upward trend, he noted, perhaps due to a better rate of mandated reporting by faculty.

Carlson stated the most common means for cheating involve online and hybrid courses that include online testing as well as plagiarism via the "cutting and pasting" of material from online sources. In order to actively prevent misconduct, faculty members use a variety of resources including TurnItIn and constant monitoring of websites like "Course Hero" where students can purchase old papers or exams. A current challenge is making sure that all faculty mandatorily report instances of cheating in order to better track multiple instances of misconduct by repeat students. In addition, Carlson said that students not understanding what constitutes plagiarism has been a constant challenge as well.

Finally, Carlson said that additional resources such as online test security and proctoring and high quality lock down browsers would be helpful resources for curbing the opportunity for academic misconduct. Kathrine Russell asked about educating students about the inappropriateness of sharing class notes, papers, or exams. Carlson replied that they do include some boiler plate language in syllabi that reference intellectual property rights as well as ramifications for academically dishonest work in each particular course. Many of these statements go unheeded by students so faculty are encouraged to have discussions with students, often on the first day of class, regarding academic integrity issues.

Dzik asked if it is Carlson's impression that most faculty do actually report all instances of academic dishonesty. Carlson replied that he does not think that enough faculty report to the Office of Student Conduct, but he is attempting to have more conversations with faculty to emphasize the importance of mandatory reporting. Pieranna Garavaso asked if international students are reported to the campus at a higher proportion than other students. Carlson said that he does not believe that that is occurring, nor is it any different from the rates on the Twin Cities campus.

Schott stated that since students do not seem to pay much attention to the academic integrity messaging in a syllabus, he asked Carlson if he thought that students could benefit from an online tutorial through Canvass when a student first matriculates at the campus. Carlson agreed that this sort of resource would be beneficial.

2. College Review - Carlson School of Management (CSOM) - Schott introduced Raj Singh, associate dean for the undergraduate program, Carlson School of Management (CSOM), to provide a review of academic integrity at the CSOM. Singh stated that he is a professor of finance and has been in his role as associate dean for about four years. CSOM has both undergraduate and graduate programs with about 4,400 students currently enrolled. When it

comes to the prevalence of academic dishonesty at CSOM, Singh stated that in academic year 2015-16 there were 20 reported cases, 17 cases in 2016-17, and 15 cases last academic year. The college also conducts periodic surveys of its students and found in 2018 that 88% of students agreed that there is a strong perception of academic integrity at Carlson. When asked in 2013 what student perception of academic dishonesty was in their I-Core program, 94% of students responded that there was either a low frequency of cheating or none at all. A similar survey was conducted in 2014 as well with similar, yet declining, results of 88%. Singh stated that CSOM is planning to reintroduce this survey in the spring this year.

Singh continued by stating that CSOM has several active measures in place for prevention of academic dishonesty. These measures include:

- Students are introduced to the CSOM honor code during orientation.
- Faculty are strongly encouraged to, and many do, use Proctorio and Turnitin
- Faculty include statements in syllabus and are encouraged to talk about consequences during the first day of class.
- Faculty are encouraged to report to OCS and consult with OCS staff.
- OCS staff are brought in to present to faculty.

Challenges to maintaining academic integrity to CSOM currently include the proliferation of online resources, faculty recycling of exams, lack of faculty understanding in the reporting process to OCS, and lack of “teeth” in the honor code. Singh noted that additional resources would be beneficial for assessment design that discourages academic misconduct. In addition, requiring students not familiar with the norms in U.S. universities to take some online training might be helpful. Schott opined that even though the numbers of cases within the college seem to be low, it is important that faculty remain vigilant. Singh agreed.

Schott asked if disclosing the numbers gives a perception of low frequency and not a big deal. Dzik commented that CSOM seems to well understand the facts and myths about academic dishonesty. She agreed that figures can be deceiving in this type of work and that obviously some cheating goes unreported and even more goes undetected. Singh commented that he too was interested in the proposed online Canvass module that was raised in the previous discussion. John Hourdos commented that the surveying of students was important. It would also make sense to ask these questions on a course by course basis, perhaps on the student evaluation forms after each course concludes.

3. Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB) Procedure Amendment - Schott introduced Chris Kwapick, senate associate, University Senate Office, to provide an overview of a proposed amendment to the procedures of the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB) hearing process. Kwapick stated that he was filling in for Lynette Renner, chair of the CCSB, who could not attend the hearing that day. The proposed amendment would change who is allowed to remain in the hearing room during a CCSB hearing. Currently, witnesses in a case may only be in the room during the time they are either testifying or being questioned. The proposed change would apply to cases involving scholastic dishonesty and would allow the presenting or accusing instructor to remain in the room for the entirety of the hearing, just as the accused student is allowed to remain in the room. The proposed language change is as follows:

CCSB Procedures, Section F, Subdivision 1, shall be amended as follows:

Parties should offer witnesses in person whenever possible. Each party is responsible for getting its own witnesses to the hearing. If reasonable efforts to accommodate the schedules are not successful, the unavailability of a witness is not a ground for postponement of the hearing. If an important witness prefers not to testify, the parties may ask the Panel Chair to assist in encouraging the witness to testify. When necessary, witnesses may present information by telephone or written statement. After a party's witness presents information, the other party may ask questions, and then Panel members may ask questions. Witnesses will only be allowed to appear at the hearing during their testimony, except for a witness who is the reporting instructor in cases involving academic dishonesty. In such cases, the reporting witness may appear throughout the proceeding.

Kwapick stated that the language was unanimously approved by the members of the CCSB and are asking the SAIC to endorse the proposed language change. Russell asked about the perceived power that a faculty member's presence might have during a hearing. Kwapick stated that he was not informed of any reservations of this kind by the members of the CCSB. Russell stated that she was comfortable with the change but wanted to be sure that students have some level of comfort in these hearings as well as not present a bias to panelists. Dzik stated that this change will allow for a better picture of the entire case as accusing instructors have a much better understanding of the case than a University Presenter would.

Garavaso asked if a pre-hearing conference is still conducted in order to help identify and eliminate bias. Kwapick replied that every case receives a pre-hearing in order to do just that. John Hourdos asked if panelists are provided with all possible sanctions allowed for each case. Kwapick responded that panelists were provided with that information, however that information is not found in the hearing procedure document.

Schott moved that the committee endorse the proposed amendment to the CCSB procedures, however, he noted the committee did not currently have a quorum and recommended an online vote be conducted. *Note: An online poll was taken and closed on February 22, 2019, and the motion was approved.*

4. Discussion on Academic Integrity Canvass Module for Students upon Matriculation -

Schott then opened a discussion about recommending an academic integrity Canvass module for students upon matriculation to the University. He stated that the interest stated in this meeting alone seems to give a general desire for such an action. Jacqueline Burke asked Schott for further details, specifically what students this module would apply to. Schott replied that the original intent was to have the training apply to incoming freshmen as well as newly enrolling transfer students. Burke agreed that this was a good idea. Hourdos noted that faculty and staff have to go through mandatory periodic training all the time and felt that requiring a one time module to students would be feasible. Caitlin Federicci suggested that the training be done more than once, perhaps every other year for students. Russell commented that if the committee recommends this action to the University, it should be mindful of the timing of the required module. She stated

that freshmen are inundated with information upon enrolling and through orientation. She suggested that perhaps this training be offered just prior to the start of their second semester. The committee generally agreed with this approach.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office