

Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)
April 11, 2018
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:** Policy Review: Resolving Alleged Student Conduct Code Violations; History of SAIC - Review of the Clayton Documents; Committee Recommendations on Changes in the Committee Charge]

PRESENT: Jeffrey Schott (chair), Kimberly Clark, Sara Johnson, Tracene Marshall, Mark Bultmann, Sharon Dzik, John Hourdos, Rashne Jehangir, Daniela Orza, Danielle Huey

REGRETS: Aditya Pakki, Barry McQuarrie

ABSENT: Bethany Novak, Nicholas Fleege

GUESTS: None

OTHERS: Amber Bathke, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn

Chair Jeffrey Schott welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves.

1. Policy Review: Resolving Alleged Student Conduct Code Violations - Chris Kwapick, senate associate, University Senate Office, explained that it is the practice that the SAIC review this policy periodically. He then walked through the [policy](#) and described some of the proposed changes. The current policy can be found at this link: <https://policy.umn.edu/education/studentconductcode>

Sara Johnson asked about colleges establishing their own bodies to handle cases of violations of the Student Conduct Code and if this only applies to scholastic dishonesty or if it can apply to other violations. Sharon Dzik, director, Office for Community Standards (OCS), said it allows for each college to establish their own panels for dealing with Student Conduct Code violations. John Hourdos said that if the colleges don't cover the violation, it would then fall to the University to resolve the issue.

Schott moved that the committee endorse the changes to the policy. Houdos seconded the motion. **A vote was taken and the committee unanimously approved the motion.**

2. History of SAIC - Review of the Clayton Documents - Dzik described the circumstances behind the formation of the SAIC. It came about as a result of the basketball team academic scandal in 1998. Professor Tom Clayton was the original committee chair and they created recommendations for the University including many resolutions that wouldn't involve this

committee. The committee was created to strengthen the University's commitment to academic integrity. The University Senate approved the Clayton committee report in 2000. The report recommended that new presentations about academic integrity be shown at new student orientation. Dzik said that is not happening now. There were other recommendations such as the restructuring of the Student Judicial Affairs Department, which created the new office entitled the Office for Student Academic Integrity (OSAI) which has since been changed when Student Judicial Affairs merged their name with OSAI to create the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, which then in 2017 was changed to the Office for Community Standards.

OSAI was meant to be a central repository of resources to aid members of the University community in promoting academic integrity. They should also be sponsoring discussion across the University for the reasons, ways, and means to promote and defend academic integrity. They should also develop and disseminate resource materials that promote academic integrity and condemn cheating. All of these resources are meant to help assist the faculty in the onerous burden of policing cheating.

Dzik continued that the report stated that OSAI needs adequate staffing but there has only ever been four employees allotted to the entire office. This has not changed in 14 years. The entire University community needs to be involved in preventing cheating and promoting academic integrity. Faculty vigilance is the most important defense against cheating. They need support from department heads and deans.

Dzik said that the items in these reports are why we are all here. However, it highlights the lack of involvement by other University departments especially in intentionally promoting academic integrity and involving it in as many events as possible. Tracene Marshall opined that the community does take academic integrity seriously and faculty are very much involved by including it in every syllabus. Rashne Jehangir added that she thinks new promotion mechanisms could be very useful at orientation. Marshall clarified that orientation is handled by each of the colleges.

Mark Bultmann commented that he believes this issue should be brought back to the University level. Danielle Huey said orientation is a whirlwind and it may not really sink in for students unless there is a variety of messages delivered throughout the year. Even though every syllabus has the same message, it kind of loses its effect when the same statement is just "copied and pasted" and is then never addressed again. Professors need to take a more active role. Perhaps there could be smaller group presentations so there is more emphasis on the issue.

3. Committee Recommendations on Changes to the Committee Charge - The committee then discussed ideas for the next academic year including possible changes to the committee's charge. Committee members' comments were as follows:

- Schott said that for him this discussion has highlighted the need to refocus the committee to its original intent versus where it is currently. Schott added that he thought it is important to invite other individuals from the University community to give and receive committee input. He felt that it is important for other departments to engage with the

committee as well as have the committee review what each college does to promote academic integrity.

- Jehangir said that she also serves on the Provost's Committee on Teaching and Learning and they are currently discussing how to make teaching more valued at a research University. She feels that many of the issues regarding academic integrity are aligned with the work of that committee as well. This could involve the faculty getting more involved in presenting the importance of academic integrity to every class they teach. She also felt that it is important that the committee follow up on the conversation it had about increasing resources at the Disability Resource Center (DRC) to prevent cheating, as they had a number of incidences this past year.
- Hourdos said that the committee should look at its current duties and responsibilities and review how well the committee is doing before any changes are made. He thought that the committee needed to focus more on reviewing the mechanisms to deal with academic integrity at the University as a whole, as outlined in item "a" of the charge. He also felt that the committee needs to review records of academic misconduct allegations in order to make policy recommendations, as outlined in item "c."
- Schott then presented a draft letter that the committee could use to invite representatives from appropriate University departments to join the committee as ex-officio members. He stated that the committee should also prioritize the duties and responsibilities it needs to perform in order to be most effective.
- Bultmann opined that the committee is very Twin Cities-centric and that there should be more system campus input.
- Marshall said that there are other established groups on campus the committee could tap into. Perhaps the committee could speak to each college's body that handles scholastic dishonesty.
- Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn asked about item "e" in the charge, to confer with appropriate senate committees on matters of academic integrity as needed. She thought it would be important to identify those key groups.
- Jehangir said that whomever the committee invites to join or contribute should have the ability to network or connect to other University resources.
- Hourdos felt that a representative from the DRC would be most appropriate to include since they deal with testing all of the time.
- Marshall noted that the committee should be strategic when inviting these different groups to contribute to the committee's discussion.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office