

Minutes of EPC April 10,2002  
Approved 4.24.02  
Educational Policy Committee  
Wednesday, April 10, 2002 (Meeting #8)

Present: J. Bergum, C. Bock, C. Carroll, S. Goel, R. Green, S. Hedman, K. Heikel, J. Jenson, D. Lipori, V. Magnuson, J. Peterson, D. Poe, K. Risdon, T. Wallace  
Excused: J. Doty, C. Grau, G. Keeney, P. Morton, L. Rolfe  
Absent: K. Amstutz, R. Hoffman, C. Verhaegag  
Guest: K. Skelton

Chair Carroll called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 13, 2002 MEETING MINUTES. Passed.

Chair Carroll announced that the spring Campus Assembly meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 23. The social begins at 1:30 and the Assembly meeting at 2 p.m. Both will be held in the Kirby Ballroom.

Technology task force report

The task force has met four times and has a plan to proceed but will not have anything ready for the spring Campus Assembly. K. Risdon will bring to the next EPC meeting a printed proposal from the task force. The task force is looking at how technology issues relate to faculty, staff, and students, how issues overlap, and which issues are most important to teaching.

Vice Chair nominations

K. Risdon nominated C. Bock noting that she has served the campus and her college in many ways, does excellent work, and would make a worthy and honorable leader for EPC. In the event no other EPC meetings are held this year, the committee approved an email election for the vice chair position.

Academic integrity

The academic integrity subcommittee was created by EPC following the Executive Committee of the Campus Assembly's request that EPC review the Clayton Committee Report and take appropriate action. K. Skelton, the UMD conduct code coordinator and a task force member, joined the meeting to present the subcommittee's draft academic integrity policy, reporting form, and guidelines.

Under the draft policy, reports of academic integrity will be filed with the conduct code coordinator. Central reporting will reveal which students have offenses in more than one collegiate unit. EPC members discussed who would get copies of the form, what happens if a student checks the box indicating s/he disagrees with the allegation, and the sense that a policy that requires faculty to submit an academic integrity report is a big change in the UMD culture. If reporting is required, who decides if there is academic dishonesty and if it must be reported? It is most likely that the process that occurs now would continue with the exception of filing the form with the conduct code coordinator. Though the point of filing the report is to allow the campus to discover multiple offenders, it is also necessary that the form remain private.

Members felt that the form needs a statement about notifying the department head and dean of the incident to be reported and about what will happen with any evidence. The conduct code coordinator/academic integrity officer could send confidential copies of the forms to the department head and dean. Faculty members expressed concerns about completing the report form without extremely solid evidence and about what constitutes proof or evidence? K. Skelton noted that an offense would be something that a faculty member would already report on, not things for which they are suspicious. The committee asked for guidelines of what is/is not reportable, if the policy needs university attorney review, and how to deal with instances of academic integrity where the student will not sign the form. It was suggested that the agree/disagree line be changed to say the student has read this report and understands the sanctions and is aware of her/his right to appeal. Questions of implementing sanctions with or without student signature were also raised. It was also suggested that the report be sent to student's registered address and have the student come in to discuss or appeal the matter. The committee next discussed the proposed guidelines and questioned whether faculty members may impose the sanctions listed. Separated lists of sanctions could show what faculty can do and what dean can do upon recommendation of faculty. MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED TO APPROVE THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY, REPORT, AND GUIDELINES. Withdrawn. It will be on the next EPC agenda so this committee can continue to shape these documents.

#### Mid-term alerts

This item will be on the next EPC agenda. M. Dragich will find out what action was taken on this issue by the Twin Cities University Senate.

The final exam policy will also be on the next agenda for further discussion.

#### Subcommittee reports

Academic integrity subcommittee: report above.

Academic support units advisory board: no report.

Admissions, retention, and graduation subcommittee: no report.

Information technology and the library subcommittee: no report.

Instructional Development Service advisory board: no report.

International education subcommittee: no report.

Liberal education subcommittee: student focus groups will be held over the next two weeks in six sections of six advanced composition courses. Five hundred surveys will be sent to all students in upper level composition courses. The subcommittee will have a report for EPC by the end of the semester.

Technology task force: report above.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Dragich  
Recorder

Page Coordinator: Frank Simmons  
Last Revised on 5/19/2000 by FS