

1-31-2011

Scholastic minutes 01/31/2011

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 01/31/2011" (2011). *Scholastic Committee*. 176.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/176

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 #12, January 31, 2011

The Scholastic Committee met at 9:00 on Monday, January 31, in Imholte 217.

Present: T Berberi, C Braegelmann, C Cole, A Earl, J Goodnough (Chair), S Gross, A Helgerson, L Ranelli, J Schryver, C Stemper, D Stewart

Guest: M Page

1. The Minutes of November 23 were approved.
2. Report from the chair
 - Four students returned fall 2010 after successfully appealing their suspension of fall 2009. One was successful, three failed to complete their PC contract. Four students will attend spring 2011 under PC contracts.
 - Spring agenda items include
 - Research/recommendations concerning TOEFL/IELTS cutting scores
 - Recommendation concerning approval authority for activities on study day/finals
 - Need for prospective students to submit transcripts before initial registration
 - Liaison between UMM and Admissions at feeder schools concerning the honoring of our suspension by community colleges
3. Academic Integrity Document from April 2008
 - 1.0 VIOLATIONS
 1. Items 1.1-1.4, all concerning proctors, dominate this first discussion. Revise.
 - 2.2 RESOLUTIONS
 1. This paragraph was inserted to address consequences for students who are not enrolled in the class, but collaborated with a student who was in the class. The reporting to the VCSA would result in routing to the Academic Integrity Committee for action and sanctions.
 2. A discussion of possible consequences, their pros and cons, and the feasibility of enacting them ensued.
 - 2.5 REPEAT OFFENDERS
 1. How long are records maintained in VCSA office? Policy has multiple recommendations—one states AI files are retained 5 years.
 2. Are offenses tracked across the U of M system?
 3. Who has access to the information?

Other discussion focused on the need to educate students about academic integrity in general—that there is a policy, that there are consequences that could be dire, perhaps examples of what is considered a violation, without providing how a violation could be perpetrated. Define when sharing or working together on information is collaboration/cheating/tool/off-limits. Should this be addressed during Orientation? How detailed should faculty expectations/syllabi be on AI?

PROPOSED HEARING PROCEDURES

F. Pre-hearing Conference

“Up to the start of a hearing, the accused student can accept a resolution proposed by the instructor.” Is this the appropriate time frame, or should the student be allowed to accept the proposed resolution even after the hearing has begun?

At the next meeting we will devote 15-20 minutes to Academic Integrity, then we will move on to other agenda items.

Respectfully submitted,
Dorothy De Jager