Minutes of the Board of Undergraduate Studies – 12/12/12

Members present: Blumenthal, Cleveland, Feldner, Ghasemzadeh, Lahr, Meyer, Oswald, Quade, Richie, Su, Toumanoff, Whipp

1. Reflection offered by D. Oswald

2. Minutes approved unanimously

3. G. Meyer announced that the self-study will be coming the way of the committee to provide some feedback.

4. Discussion of statement from UBUS to CCRC (see attached)
   - One revision suggested and added -- to add the following statement to the last paragraph
     - “In your deliberations, we hope that you will consider best practices in higher education, but we also encourage you to be creative in your thinking consider any ideas that allow you to be consistent with the highest ideals of Jesuit Catholic higher education.”
   - UBUS unanimously approved the statement and it will be delivered by J. Su

5. Discussion of Academic dishonesty
   - Key points:
     - Student Government, Senate and several other groups think it is a good idea;
     - call for a committee has gone to Provost but no committee has been established;
     - need to provide direction to how the committee might work;
     - G. Meyer could share this information with Stephanie Russell who is leading effort to modify mission
     - idea of this as possible mission intended to get all stakeholders involved
     - also do not want to lose that this would be a challenge/recommendation to committee to ask colleges to take more responsibility in this process;
     - question of who would be on the committee?
       - one strategy is to ask for each college to send a representative
       - another strategy is to work on an open call via news briefs that might be able to invite any faculty who are interested in working;
       - consider broad call and talk with associate dean to see who is following up on cases and is thinking about it creatively;
       - have a combined approach to how we get faculty;
       - might also need to have open forums and larger conversations
     - Need to be mindful of taking incremental steps -- that is a complete code is a long way off but we can start addressing it orientation and in other short term steps;
     - Senate wants a broad and representative committee and subcommittee was enthusiastic -- and that group is still willing to work on it;
       - broadly representative committee could break into smaller task forces
       - the committee could decide implementation plans via task forces;
       - concern is that the original group had a lot of administrators
     - need to keep students involved in writing the code;
       - also want to get on agenda of groups like student government and graduate student government;
another place to consider are RAs get conversations with RAs, also undergraduate teaching assistants,
- college councils;
  - also need to think about having students involved in adjudicating these issues - dean of students office would be willing to work on this;
  - reference of UVa which has a code with one penalty which is expulsion;
  - need to get students to understand how this impacts students and what is their stake - they need to see this as relevant;
  - need to keep process centralized so that it does in fact have a way of follow-through and so faculty see it as effective;
  - there are models so do we not need to re-create wheel.
- Need a process for selecting committee; then also need consider the ideal make-up of the committee;
  - is there a place in there to understand the motivation of students and why they do engage in these behaviors?
    - addressing motivation would come back to the education issue - having a centralized place and then allows us to look for pockets and trends and go back to the systems and see where there is needs to be changed;
    - feeling that students know what is right/wrong but it is not explicitly stated - focus groups talk about how students will respond;
    - students do want to be students of integrity but there are no formal guidelines;
    - will be hard to get student input but there are a few who would be interested in participating particularly in the adjudicating;
  - important that provost is behind the effort - for example call comes from the Provost – and that is clear that a committee would be focused on specific plans this to implement these recommendations;
  - committee should be chaired by a faculty; we should charge that group to be a steering committee; perhaps would take that group and have them charged as a steering committee to allow for subcommittees;
- Motion to send the following charge to Provost John Pauly:
  - The UBUS recommends and requests that the Provost name the academic integrity subcommittee be named as the steering committee to implement the recommendations from the report on academic integrity.
    - Substitutions may be made as needed given changes in roles of some of the original committee.
    - The academic integrity steering committee will be empowered to recruit and name sub-committees/task forces as needed.
    - It is hoped that the committee will be in place to begin work on January 21st, 2013
    - Steering committee will provide an interim report that includes all subcommittee/task forces (including membership) and any actions in progress by final meeting of the Academic Senate (April 24, 2013)
  - Motion carried unanimously

6. Meeting adjourned at 2:25pm

Respectfully submitted by Sarah B. Feldner