

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Scholastic Committee

Campus Governance

4-27-2017

Scholastic minutes 04/27/2017

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 04/27/2017" (2017). *Scholastic Committee*. 289.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/289

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.

**Scholastic Committee
2016-17 Academic Year
April 27, 2017
Meeting Twenty-two Minutes**

Present: Roland Guyotte (chair), Judy Korn, Merc Chasman, Leslie Meek, Brenda Boever, Parker Smith, Jennifer Goodnough, Ray Schultz, Ruby DeBellis, Steve Gross, Dan Magner, Emma Kloos, Josiah Gregg, Joe Beaver, Emily Trieu

Guests: Sandy Olson-Loy and Hannah Pallmeyer

1. Approve minutes of April 20, 2017, meeting

Minutes approved as amended.

2. Chair's Report

Sandy Olson-Loy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs provided an update regarding the Test Center discussion. Olson-Loy stated there are ongoing discussions working to identify the best way to deliver services provided by the Test Center.

The Scholastic Committee is on the agenda for the upcoming Campus Assembly meeting on Tuesday, May 2 to provide information regarding the new Multi-I policy for the Morris campus. Judy Korn and Merc Chasman will represent the Scholastic Committee and provide the update at Campus Assembly.

3. SCEP Report

SCEP has not met.

Jennifer Goodnough, Morris representative to SCEP, was quoted in the *Minnesota Daily* stating that Twin Cities faculty wanted to be included in Morris's exception to the Makeup policy.

4. Petition #1259

Petition approved.

5. Academic Integrity presentation

Sandy Olson Loy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and Hannah Pallmeyer, Student Affairs, provided a review of scholastic dishonesty incidents and reporting procedures (Addendum One).

The data show an increase in the number of total incidents beginning fall 2000. The low number of incidents reported between 2000-05 could be because faculty were not aware of the system for reporting or addressing academic dishonesty incidents.

The 2012-13 increase in incidents correlates to the increase in international students. Many of these incidents could stem from cultural differences and not understanding U.S. expectations. In

some countries repeating what was said by an instructor or author is viewed as a sign of respect and esteem.

Examples of incidents reported include: cheating on exams/quizzes/assignments; plagiarism; unauthorized collaboration on homework; falsified data/records.

The number of total incidents and the numbers of individuals with one or more violations or with multiples violations don't always add up because a previous violation may have taken place during a previous year.

Academic dishonesty violations may be easier to identify in some disciplines.

Faculty resolve by imposing sanctions in consultation with the student. Examples of sanctions include: assigning a zero on an assignment/homework/quiz/exams; verbal/written warning; lower letter grade by one letter; Division of Education Communication of Concern process; suspension; probation; and in one case, expulsion. If a student is not in agreement with the sanction then the case will be heard at an Academic Integrity Committee hearing. Students with multiple violations must also attend an Academic Integrity hearing.

Additional sanctions include letters of apology and restitution. Often the Academic Integrity Committee is concerned with educating the student about why what they did was wrong and have students write a paper, talk to faculty or do research. Sanctions are not just about punishment, but also educating the student in hopes that they will learn from the situation and the incident never happens again.

It is very rare for students to challenge a violation, but policy and procedure are in place if a student wishes to challenge. The new reporting form allows students to submit letters in their file explaining the incident and sharing their perspective.

The procedure for reporting an academic dishonesty incident begins with the faculty member identifying the violation. The faculty member then investigates and talks with the student involved. Then the faculty member then documents the incident using the Scholastic Dishonesty Report form which are reviewed by Hannah Pallmeyer and then sent to Sandy Olson Loy. Hannah's review includes sending due process notification to the student.

Some faculty were discouraged from reporting because of unsuccessful attempts to contact the student. In response, the new form allows faculty to continue with the reporting process by adding "The student has not responded to my meeting request" to the question of whether the incident was discussed with the student.

There is a large selection of options for an instructor to choose for an academic penalty along with an "Other" option if they wish to assign something different.

The new form also allows for the inclusion of supporting documentation such as material taken from wikipedia and the student's paper. The supporting documentation will remain in the file and can be shared with the Academic Integrity Committee if a hearing is required.

If a student has multiple violations and one including a behavior violation then the incident is handled by the Behavior Committee which is appointed through the Student Affairs Committee. The Academic Integrity Committee is appointed by the Scholastic Committee.

It is encouraged that incidents are reported in a timely manner. It becomes awkward if an incident is reported 4-8 weeks later and the incident is challenged by the student.

As stated before, student challenges are rare because the process and procedure for reporting incidents is fair. If a student challenges an incident, the student is assigned an impartial liaison, LeAnn Dean, and the student can also bring an advocate to support their argument. Adele Lawler, Dean's Office, is the support person for the Academic Integrity Committee and she contacts LeAnn Dean to discuss availability and schedule a meeting with the student. Lawler then contacts the student on behalf of the committee and emphasized the importance of the meeting with Dean. The liaison makes sure the student knows and understands their rights and the process. The liaison also helps students with the appeal process.

International students tend to consult with faculty and staff in International Student Programs.

The student received information on where the record lives and who it gets communicated to. Students are notified that their record is protected by FERPA and will only be released with their permission or if there is a legitimate business need. Student Affairs will not release their record to graduate schools unless it is requested.

It was noted that plagiarism in 1000-level and 2000-level courses during a student's first year usually doesn't affect admission into many graduate schools. It is not an automatic denial for professional schools, but they will watch the student more closely.

It was noted that for students in Education, sanctions can have a bigger impact on their academic career. A lower letter grade in a course could result in a student being removed from the program. The Education department has to follow stricter program standards and some do not allow for readmission.

Is there any data about what happens to students after violations and sanctions? No, there's been no work done to gather this information. However, many students learn and get help to address the issue. Repeat offenders are not common.

6. Global Village Task Force proposal continued

Judy Korn provided an update on the Global Village proposal (Addendum Two). One of the key points to note is the statement explaining how to satisfy the requirement. A member believed the students wouldn't see the confusing language as the assigning of the general education categories happens at the course approval level, but it was noted that the language would still appear in the provisions.

It was noted that the proposal being reviewed by the Scholastic Committee is different than what was shown to the disciplines. It was noted at the discipline meetings that the proposal was not finished.

A member commented that the new proposal was complicating the general education requirement which is the opposite of what the Higher Learning Commission is requesting.

A concern was expressed that if students are allowed to “double dip” in the general education categories the science and math students are going to be required to take 2-3 more courses than currently required while students in other disciplines may be able to take 2-3 less courses. If a requirement is perceived to be unfair it could be damaging to the campus image.

Another concern voiced during discipline meetings was that the new definition for the Environmental Stewardship requirement would mean that many of the environmental science and environmental studies courses would no longer satisfy the requirement. The same was true for courses that would satisfy the International Perspectives requirement.

The Curriculum Committee will vote on the proposal on Monday, May 1. Members would like to express their concern to Curriculum Committee and suggest they continue refining the requirement before voting.

Roland Guyotte, Scholastic Committee Chair, has agreed to send a letter to the Curriculum Committee (Addendum Three).

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger
Office of the Registrar

Addendum One: Academic Integrity Report Summary and Scholastic Dishonesty Report Form

Summary of Academic Integrity Incidents at UMM

2016-17 (as of 4/21/17)					
Number of Incidents	Type of Incident	Academic Division	Academic Discipline	Course level	Sanction Given by Faculty
8	Plagiarism on homework or paper	Science and Math, Social Science, Humanities, Education	Chemistry, Environmental Studies, Psychology, Math, Psychology, English, Secondary Education	1000, 2000	Zero on Assignment, Verbal or written warning, Redo assignment, Redo assignment with a lower grade
3	Cheating on in class exam and take home exam	Science and Math, Social Science	Management, Psychology, Biology	1000, 2000	Zero on assignment, Verbal or written warning
4	Cheating on assignment	Science and Math	Biology, Math	3000, 4000	Zero on assignment, Verbal or written warning
3	Falsified data/records	Science and Math, Education	Biology, Secondary Education	3000, 4000	Zero on assignment, Lower letter grade by one letter
1	Unauthorized collaboration	Education	Elementary Education	3000	Zero on assignment, Verbal or written warning, Division of Education Communication of Concern process
1	Unauthorized collaboration + Plagiarism	Education	Elementary Education	3000	Grade on Assignment, re-do the assignments, required to view an online presentation about Academic Integrity and complete an accompanying quiz, Division of Education Communication of Concern process
20 Total					
2015-2016					
Number of Incidents	Type of Incident	Academic Division	Academic Discipline	Course level	Sanction Given by Faculty
6	Plagiarism on homework or paper	Science and Math, Social Sciences	Biology, Psychology, Chemistry	3000, 1000	Zero on Assignment
20	Cheating on in class exam and take home exam	Sciences	Chemistry, Mathematics, Economics	1000	Nothing but filed report, Zero on exam, Zero on take home and 5 point lecture point penalty
2	Cheating on assignment	Science and Math	Mathematics	1000	Zero on Assignment
2	Cheating on homework	Science and Math	Mathematics	1000	Zero on homework (able to drop lowest grade)
1	Forged quiz	Social Science	Economics	1000	Zero on quiz
2	Cheating in class quiz	Science and Math	Chemistry	1000	5 point deduction from class total points
33 Total					
2014-2015					
Number of Incidents	Type of Incident	Academic Division	Academic Discipline	Course level	Sanction Given by Faculty
2	Submitting work not their own	Science and Math, Humanities	Physics, French	1000	Zero for the assignment, Zero for all affected labs
20	Plagiarism and Artistic plagiarism	Humanities, Social Science, Science and Math	English, Biology, Psychology, History, Humanities, Art History, Studio Art	1000, 2000, 3000, 4000	Zero or F on assignment or paper, F on essay, failed course, reduced grade
1	Copying neighbors work during exam	Science and Math	Math	1000	Zero on midterm
9	Cheating on quiz or exam	Social Science, Science and Math	Management, Economics, Statistics	3000	Zero on quiz, zero on exams, modification of syllabus, no penalties,
4	Cheating on homework and exam	Science and Math	Math, Statistics	3000	Zero on homework, Zero on exam
1	Unauthorized collaboration	Science and Math	Chemistry	1000	Assignment grade lowered
37 Total					

Overall Summary

Incident Counts and Divisions

Academic Year	Total Incidents	Individuals		Academic Division				
		With 1 or More violations	With Multiple Violations	Educational	Humanities	Science and Math	Social Science	Interdisciplinary Studies
2016-2017 (as of 4/21/17)	20	20	1	5	3	6	6	0
2015-2016	33	33	1	0	0	26	7	0
2014 - 2015	37	35	6	0	13	16	8	0
2013 - 2014	20	19	3	3	6	8	3	0
2012 - 2013	56	51	7	0	8	29	16	3
2011 - 2012	10	10	3	0	1	4	5	0
2010 - 2011	18	17	1	0	7	7	4	0
Total Fall 2010 to present	194	185	22	8	38	96	49	3
2009 - 2010	16	14	2		4	8	4	
2008 - 2009	1	1						1
2007 - 2008	8	8			5	3		
2006 - 2007	10	8	1		7		3	
2005- 2006	2	2			1		1	
Total Fall 2005 to Spring 2010	37	33	3	0	17	11	8	1
2004- 2005	7	7			5		2	
2003- 2004	8	8			1	5	2	
2002- 2003	1	1					1	
2001- 2002	10	10			3	4	1	1
2000- 2001	1	1			1			
Total Fall 2000 to Spring 2005	27	27	0	0	10	9	6	1
Total Fall 2000 to Spring 2017	258	245	25	8	65	116	63	5

Morris Academic Integrity Violations - Multiple Violations*

Year	Number of Individuals with Multiple Violations	Academic Divisions	Sanction Given by Academic Integrity Committee
2016-17	1	Science and Math	Required Compliance, Probation, Restitution
2015-16	0	---	---
2014-15	6	Humanities, Science and Math (2), Social Science	Expulsion, Suspension, Required Compliance, Probation
2013-14	3	Humanities, Science and Math	Suspension, Required Compliance, Probation, Restitution
2012-13	7	Social Science (5), Science and Math (7), Humanities (1)	Suspension, Required Compliance, Probation, Restitution
2011- 12	0	---	---
2010- 11	1	Social Science	Suspension, Probation, Required Compliance, Restitution

* Note: Multiple violations are reported in the year of the second violation when the issue was addressed.
Not all violations occurred in the same year.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MORRIS

Scholastic Dishonesty Report Form

You will need to include the following information on this report form

1. The **full name of the student(s)** you are reporting along with their University of Minnesota student identification number to help us correctly identify them. If you are unable to find the student's identification number, you may include their University of Minnesota email address instead.
2. **Your name, title, and contact information.**
3. The **division in which the incident occurred.**
4. The **course designator, course number, section and course term**
5. A **description of the incident** that occurred.
6. If you met with the student, please include a **short description of your meeting and the student's response.**
7. The **academic penalty** that you, as the instructor, determined. For information on sanctioning guidelines please refer to the box to the right of this page.
8. Attach **supporting documentation**, such as an assignment that contained plagiarized material, source material, a copy of an exam, or a "cheat sheet".

At the bottom of the form, you may check a box to request that a copy of the report be sent to your University of Minnesota email account.

Reporting Party Information

Enable additional features by [logging in \(https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofMNMorris&layout_id=3&promptforauth=true\)](https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofMNMorris&layout_id=3&promptforauth=true).

Your full name:

Your position/title:

Your UMN email address:

Course designator,number,title:

Date of incident (Required):

YYYY-MM-DD

[Open Calendar](#)

Academic division of course (Required):

Please select a division ...

Involved Students

Name (Last, First)

Select Role

Please choose...

ID Number

Add another

Incident Information

Please provide a description of the incident using specific and objective language (e.g. what, where, when, and how it happened). (Required)

Have you discussed this incident with the student(s)? (Required)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ The student has not responded to my meeting request

If you have discussed this incident with the student, please describe that interaction below. If the student has taken responsibility for committing scholastic dishonesty, please note that here.

When instructors determine that scholastic dishonesty has most likely occurred, they have the responsibility to assign an appropriate academic penalty given the nature of their course. For assistance in determining an appropriate penalty you may consult your division chair or the Academic Integrity website (<http://committees.morris.umn.edu/academic-integrity>). **What academic penalty did you determine was appropriate in this situation?** (Please check as many as apply) (Required)

- ☐ Written or oral warning
- ☐ Zero on the assignment or exam
- ☐ Required student to redo the assignment/exam
- ☐ Lowered student's grade on assignment/exam
- ☐ Lowered the student's grade in the course
- ☐ F in the course
- ☐ Other academic penalty
- ☐ No academic penalty

Please provide any additional information on action taken including any written or oral warnings or meetings with the student, and any other sanctions/penalties that have been determined.

Supporting Documentation

Please attach a copy, if possible, of the student's paper, exam or assignment in question and any other relevant materials such as source material for the plagiarized content, a "cheat sheet", the course syllabus, relevant email communication, etc. 1GB maximum

total size.

Attachments require time to upload, so please be patient after submitting this form.

Choose files to upload

Choose Files

One last step ...

Help us prevent spam reports by completing this captcha.

NOTE: If you do not see a gray box with a checkbox that says "I'm not a robot", please try a different web browser.

I'm not a robot

reCAPTCHA
[Privacy](#) · [Terms](#)

☐ Email me a copy of this report

Submit report

Addendum Two: Global Village Task Force Proposal

Global Village Task Force Proposal

Curriculum Committee

April 17, 2017

UMM General Education can be understood as having four pieces (or covering four different kinds of areas):

1. IC
2. Liberal Arts skills
3. Liberal Studies: Ways of Knowing
4. Integrated Liberal Studies: Making Connections

The terminology clarifies the distinctiveness of this category and now corresponds to the learning outcomes, while keeping the fundamental definitions that divisions were strongly in favor of keeping.

IV. Integrated Liberal Studies: Making Connections

To increase students' understanding of the interdependence of knowledge, including the impact individuals, societies, and the environment have on one another, to help better prepare students for the complex interactions of civic and professional life. These courses synthesize such things as methods, communication styles, perspectives and interpretations, rather than focusing on a single approach or discipline.

The Integrated Liberal Studies requirements can be met by any approved courses that meet the criteria below. As general education category IV requires significant integrative learning and the synthesis of college skills, category IV can be met by any 4cr 2xxx, 3xxx, or 4xxx courses, whether or not that course also carries a general education designator from category II or III. It may also be met by any 1xxx or any 2cr 2xxx, 3xxx, 4xxx course that has been approved (see criteria), but these will carry only one of the designators below. Students must take at least one course in EACH of these areas:

A. U.S. Cultures and Connections (was Human Diversity)

To increase students' understanding of the differences between individuals and the shared cultures to which individuals belong within the U.S., with focus on the social constructs under which people across the world live, on examination of criteria that define a single (or multiple) shared culture and how individuals become members, and on the values, traditions, and interactions between different shared cultures.

B. International Cultures and Connections (was International Perspectives)

To develop students' international and intercultural skills and to increase students' understanding of the differences between individuals and the shared cultures to which individuals belong outside the U.S., with focus on the social constructs under which people across the world live, on examination of criteria that define a single (or multiple) shared culture and how individuals become members, and on the values, traditions, and interactions between different shared cultures.

C. Environmental Stewardship (was People and the Environment)

To increase students' understanding of the interdependence between human societies and the natural world, to be able to assess these interdependencies, find mutually beneficial solutions when conflicting priorities arise, and ultimately improve students' ability to sustain both.

D. Ethical Reasoning and Civic Engagement (was Ethical and Civic Responsibility)

To broaden and develop students' capacity to question and reflect upon their own and society's values and critical responsibilities, and to understand forces, such as technology, that cause them to modify these values and mandate creation of new ways to resolve legal, social, and scientific conflicts.

POSSIBLE COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND APPROVAL PROCESS

Courses that fulfill the Integrated Liberal Studies requirement employ not just one methodology or one discipline's methodology, but demonstrably utilize **cross-disciplinary** material and require students to **synthesize** approaches and/or material. Evidence that a course meets this requirement would include:

1. Answers to questions such as these:
 - a. What is being synthesized--what 2 or more areas of study or methodology will the course include and to what extent? (introducing a topic alone is not sufficient)
 - b. How will that synthesis be assessed--what assignments (briefly describe your plans) will require students to synthesize multiple approaches or areas?
2. At least a draft syllabus, perhaps with particularly relevant features on it highlighted.

(The task force collected sample answers and syllabi for courses currently in these categories from colleagues in Humanities, Science & Math, and Education.)

Curriculum Committee (or a sub-committee?) or some other group (maybe just divisions?) would have to review the above material and decide whether or not a course met the requirements.

AP credit courses would *not* count in this category because we could not verify the synthesis aspect; transfer courses would probably have to be re-evaluated by disciplines.

Addendum Three:

To: Members of the Curriculum Committee

From: Roland Guyotte, chair, Scholastic Committee

Subject: Report of the Global Village Task Force

I write to express the concern and reservations of the Scholastic Committee about the proposals embodied in the Global Village Task Force document. We have had brief discussions of the document in our meetings of April 20 and 27.

Our concerns and reservations derive from the Scholastic Committee's constitutional mandate to oversee "such matters as admissions, academic progress, academic advising . . . scholarship and graduation." Although members favor requirements in the four reconstituted "global village" areas, we are concerned that the proposal as written may cause confusion for students. Some students may actually take fewer GER credits under the new proposal but others who do not fully understand the opportunities to satisfy two GERs with one course may end up taking more credits to satisfy the same GERs.

We have reservations about the effect on entering students of prohibiting application of AP classes to the new requirements and on transfer students by requiring that their coursework to undergo an additional review process allocated to the academic disciplines. The new definitions for the Global Village requirements may greatly impact the number of courses that Morris is able to accept in transfer. In addition to concerns about fairness—the AP prohibition—and efficiency—only imagine the difficulty in getting timely reviews of a hundred transfer students' coursework—committee members have expressed reservations about potential negative impact on enrollment as Admissions officers have to counter prospective student complaints that UMM places more obstacles to their successful graduation than competing institutions do.