

11-9-2010

Scholastic minutes 11/09/2010

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 11/09/2010" (2010). *Scholastic Committee*. 179.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/179

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholastic Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

University of Minnesota, Morris Scholastic Committee
Meeting #9, November 9, 2010

The Scholastic Committee met at 9:00 on Tuesday, November 9, in Behmler 130.

Present: J Goodnough (Chair), C Braegelmann, C Cole, E Christensen, A Earl, S Gross, S Haugen, L Ranelli, J Ratliff-Crain, J Richards, D Stewart

1. The Minutes of November 3 were approved with one editorial correction.

2. Report from the chair

The committee report from the last Campus Assembly meeting was sent to <ummcampusassembly>.

No data has been received from Admissions to date.

Dean Contant will meet with the committee on November 23 about international student issues.

3. Continued discussion of Academic Integrity procedures – documents provided for discussion included:

Edited Agenda, Minutes, and Additional Details of June 2010 Academic Integrity case

Order of Proceedings prepared by Chair of that case

UMM Student Behavior Committee Hearing Procedures

Timeline:

More discussion today to identify issues, what we like or don't like about what we've been doing, questions, concerns etc. Then a rough draft will be created, VCSA will be invited to a meeting to discuss the draft (possibly in early December)

Known Questions/Concerns

- Do we want a regular report? Biennial?
 - Do we know how many cases have occurred over the past few years? Should we request annual reporting by the VCSA? A report would provide evidence of follow through on reported cases, which may encourage all faculty to report violations; it would provide the ability to identify repeat offenders; it would provide information such as the types of sanctions to use as guidelines.
 - Inclusion year in school could identify the populations that are committing offenses
- Timing – Consensus was for an annual report, divided into semesters, presented at first committee meeting in the fall.
- Should subcommittee members have a longer term? – The discussion was more about the need for backups and for standard procedures to provide them. [The Procedures for the Student Behavior Committee state that the Panel Chair, (usually Chair of SBC but can be a designee) convenes a pre-hearing conference, at which the parties are informed of the names of the Panel Chair and potential members of the panel. The Chair and/or members and/or collegiate representatives may be challenged for conflict of interest or bias. Replacements are appointed from the SBC or by the VCSA as appropriate.]
- Hearing Procedure details – The ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS, 8. Committee retires to deliberate.\ a. Assistant Dean Attends. In fall 2009, the Committee approved a change in membership of the UMM Academic Integrity Subcommittee: the position formerly held by the Secretary of the Scholastic Committee is currently filled by the UMM representative to the Student Academic Integrity Committee. To avoid any perception of

conflict of interest or impropriety, the hearing for deliberation will be closed. The Assistant Dean will serve as a resource to the subcommittee but will not attend the hearing. The role of the assistant dean was recommended to include:

- Initiate communication
- Set up the pre-hearing conference and hearing
- Clarify proceedings
- Arrange additional contacts, collect information
- From a neutral position, advise the subcommittee of possible sanctions, but do not recommend choice

Sanctions are defined in the Regent's Policy: Student Conduct Code.

- Legal – some language in the documents has been changed, e.g., guilty is not the appropriate term, rather use “responsible for.” Determinations are made based on a preponderance of evidence, not reasonable doubt.
- Who, internally, can or should see file?
- How long is the file kept? – will be determined
- Is current non hearing procedure too dense in document? – no time for discussion
- Resources
 - People for students – assistant dean
 - People for faculty
 - Online info wrt citing and evaluating web sources (not new wheel)

Submitted by Dorothy De Jager