

**SLAAC Minutes
September 13, 2011**

Present: Caroline Smith (Chair), Sharmin Tunguz, Jeff Dunn, Charles Pierre, Arezoo Nazari, Dorian Shager, Mark McCoy, Carrie Klaus, Leslie James, Kathryn Millis (minutes).

1. **Introduction of members**
2. **Meeting time**
Future meetings will start at 4:05 to accommodate travel from classes.
3. **Appointment of secretary**
Kathryn agreed to serve.
4. **Approval of URC and CSC faculty pool (see agenda)**
Approved. Several people volunteered to serve on either; this should be fine because there are so few panels held that each individual is unlikely to be called at all. CSC volunteers are usually trained in advance so Carrie and Meggan Johnston will divide the names, and Meggan will schedule CSC training. Charles and Arezoo will include URC and CSC information in their call for students to serve on committees.
5. **DSOC**
Deadline for faculty members to volunteer is next week, so we'll approve at our next meeting.
6. **Religious Holidays Observances – letter to students (see agenda)**
Members appreciate Kate Smanik's initiative and request for feedback. There was some discussion of rights. We suggest a simple "reminder" of DePauw's policy. We note that the faculty are reminded at the beginning of every semester of the policy on Religious Holy Days (among others), but don't think students are; students (especially given diverse backgrounds) may not understand their rights and responsibilities here. There was brief discussion of when students should be expected to familiarize themselves with policies (e.g., read the student handbook) and when to remind them, and how many reminders are helpful, how many are too many. Caroline will contact Kate re: SLAAC's recommendation.
7. **DPU Sexual Misconduct Policy (Cindy Babington)**
The U.S. federal Department of Education sent a "Dear Colleague" Letter about sexual harassment in April. (Dear Colleague is a series of guidelines and recommendations, routinely sent to education institutions). It calls for schools to address charges of sexual harassment or sexual violence by using a "preponderance of the evidence" standard, not the "beyond a reasonable

doubt” standard used by the legal system.

However, some students at other schools who have been accused of harassment have objected to being punished based on this lower standard of proof. Recently, a student at Sewanee was expelled for rape, sued, and won. He received only reimbursement of his tuition, not damages. Will future cases follow, so students expelled (for various offenses) might be able to make DePauw return their tuition? How much of this decision was based on the lower standard of proof, which is exactly what the DOE says is required? At DePauw, we send accusations of sexual violence to the local prosecutor, but they have never taken a case to trial. These cases can be hard to prove to the legal standards of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Our student sexual misconduct policy is largely in line with DOE suggestions, but they also suggest several things the University has done but not necessarily made explicit in policy, such as provide special tutoring for the accused and/or survivor/victim so they don’t get behind in classes, and give both the option to withdraw from courses without penalties. Should we discuss revising DePauw’s policy to make those explicit?

Several years ago staff (but not faculty) were given sexual harassment training, and it has been included in new faculty orientation for several years, but longstanding faculty members have never been trained, and we weren’t sure about new non-faculty employees.

Cindy has no specific need from the committee at this point, but distributed the University’s policy and the Dear Colleague letter. Please read and we’ll discuss at our next meeting (9/27/22).

8. **Nature Park Advisory Committee**

As far back as AY 2008-2009, university administrators decided there should be an advisory committee for the Nature Park, and that SLAAC appeared to be the best fit for a reporting relationship that's consistent with other advisory committees and supports the idea that the park is intended for student benefit. The variety of uses and user constituencies (e.g., science and non-science classes, science research projects, school and community groups, individuals, and activities like weddings) should be discussed in a broadly constituted group. Apparently, it was agreed that SLAAC could generate a proposal to make the committee permanent, including recommendations on the charge, and how to best elect or appoint representatives of various user constituencies, but after several discussions last year, SLAAC recommended that the Nature Park Advisory Committee should remain “ad hoc” and that codification of a standing committee should be done as part of the governance restructuring, or in AY 2013-2014.

SLAAC again has been asked to complete this task, with the caveat that waiting to see what happens with faculty governance is not necessary. The prevailing thought is that it is better to make good changes even if they *might* only last a few months, since reorganization of faculty governance could take some time and we ought to have our rules in line with good practice.

Cindy is no longer the supervisor. The committee is now under Dick Vance.'s supervision. Kathryn & Cindy agreed to compile what SLAAC agreed on last year, & forward to Caroline. Cindy will convene the group as it exists now, to discuss any pending matters.

7. Pending Business:

Carrie will soon bring us a draft "Statement in Student Handbook directing students toward appropriate resources handling for course-related conflicts and/or complaints" for input.

Cindy announced that the administration is discussing an Indiana law that says the Board of Trustees can give campus police power off campus, in the community. Could SLAAC please talk with Angie Nally (and others?) about this? Trustees may discuss this at their October meeting. Police have no legal right to protect visiting speakers during their travel to campus, no right to subpoena or arrest suspects (e.g., of Harrison thefts) who are off campus, etc. Caroline will ask Angie to come to the next meeting. Possible concerns may include that Greencastle residents would imagine students treated differently, would not accept DePauw police authority over them, or that there would be pressure to cut the local police budget and expect DePauw to handle problems.

SLAAC Minutes
October 25, 2011
4:05 pm; Julian 300

Present: Caroline Smith (Chair), Cindy Babington, Kathryn Millis, Walker Chance, Charles Pierre, Arezoo Nazari, David Alverez, Carrie Klaus, Dorian Shager, Jeff Dunn

1. Appointment of secretary – Dorian Shager

2. Approval of 10-11-11 Minutes

[file:///localhost/Users/depauwuniversity/Desktop/SLAAC Minutes 10-11-11.docx](file:///localhost/Users/depauwuniversity/Desktop/SLAAC%20Minutes%2010-11-11.docx)

3. Continued discussion of renaming the Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form

a. Editorial on academic integrity

b. Follow-up letter to the editor signed by Pedar Foss and Carrie Klaus

- I. Discussed issues related to academic dishonesty article in The DePauw, Editorial Board, and Carrie Klaus/Pedar Foss 10/4/11 Letter to the Editor.
- II. Forgetfulness of students relates to google/Wikipedia. If researching in library, then take notes/cite. But if it is just picking up quick on-line information for papers, then many students don't take notes.
- III. We do not consider anything on Wikipedia common knowledge. If you have to look it up, it is not common knowledge.
- IV. Do students remember talking about this topic in first year seminar? Yes, kind of. The book is straightforward, does a decent job, talked about it in class.
- V. It would be good to spend more time to reinforce this idea; so much stuff is thrown at first year students, good to reinforce information later. Later, meaning both more within the first year seminar and more outside of seminar.
- VI. What is the editorial trying to say? That it is okay for students to not cite web searches? That intent and action are different things?
- VII. The concern/uncertainty is what do students think about this topic?
- VIII. A good conversation, but don't need to dwell on it. Good to highlight what is academic dishonesty.
- IX. The letter to the editor was a good letter and highlights points that needed to be made.
- X. 2004 is when we started to use the Lipson book and made a push on this topic. The number of cases decreased at that point and has steadily been increasing recently. Maybe it is time for a new push on this topic, broader emphasis/conversation.

- XI. Should we rename the Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form? Call it the Settlement Form for Violation of Academic Integrity Policy. This would address concerns of miss citing, carelessness, etc., that faculty may not feel is academic dishonesty
- XI. Interesting that it is called the Academic Integrity Policy when it only addresses Academic Dishonesty.
- XII. There is a tension within the current policy that addresses “intent” in different manners (i.e. this policy talks a lot about intent, but the link to the Writing Center document states intent does not matter).
- XIII. In recent years, URC’s have been determining that intent did not matter.
- XIV. It is difficult to figure out someone’s intention.
- XV. It seems like this is actually an academic dishonesty policy. Academic Integrity is just the lead in. Since it is really about academic dishonesty, then don’t change the form. Own that it is academic dishonesty.
- XVI. Does dishonesty imply intention?
- XVII. It is academic dishonesty, not student dishonesty. Not about the person, about the behavior.
- XVIII. Some people who want to change the term, because it is a morally focused term.
- XIX. Kenyon calls it Academic Honesty . . . Academic Infractions.
- XX. If it is an issue of terms, seems like we should change the term in the policy first and have the form terminology flow from the policy language.
- XXI. Student Life, it is the “Alcohol Policy” not the “Binge Drinking Policy.”
- XXII. What we call it matters for how we think about it.
- XXIII. More faculty may be willing to use the form if it is titled something else
- XXIV. I think most faculty are okay with it as is; there are a few vocal and concerned faculty.
- XXV. If we rename the form, no big deal. If we rename the policy, then there will be more opinions.
- XXVI. Change the form to be titled “Settlement form for violation of the Academic Integrity Policy.” Need to update the handbook where it currently says “Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form.”
- XXVII. We are all in agreement with this change.
- XXVIII. It does not fully address the underlying issues, may still need more conversation with faculty.

4. Possible additional language for Student Handbook directing students to appropriate resources when they have concerns about a class.

Most often if students have a complaint about a course or teaching, they should first talk with the instructor. If they are uncomfortable doing so

or feel they need further advice or assistance, they should consult with the appropriate department chair or an academic dean. Students may also consult with their academic advisor, who can help them identify appropriate resources. For matters involving a possible grievance, see the section of this handbook on grievances.

- I. Relates to a SLAAC topic from last year. Responding to Student Government concerns. Students do not know who to turn to if they have a concern about their class.
- II. Is this necessary? Does this language address it? Where would it be placed in the Handbook?
- III. It would be helpful and the wording is great. Speaks to students who are not as informed. First-Year students are more intimidated about going to talk to professors. The language is encouraging.
- IV. This is great, but will students get this message if it is in the handbook. Where else does it need to be? On-line, Seminar, etc.
- V. Current headings in the Handbook under Academic Life are Academic Expectations for DePauw Students, Academic Programs and Resources, Academic Policies and Procedures.
- VI. How big of an issue is this? Prevalence influences location. Some think this is a really pressing issue.
- VII. Burying it in the Handbook is not the best way to do this, but having it in the Handbook is helpful for documenting it.
- VIII. Does not need to be a standalone policy. This is not a policy that students would be charged with violating.
- IX. Lengthy discussion of the best location for this statement to be in the Student Handbook
- X. Language: Should it say “Most often if students have concern or complaint” instead of just complaint’?
- XI. Do we add an intro, such as, “DePauw is committed to strong teaching,”?
- XII. Concern that the current language in the “Student Assessment of Teaching” Student Handbook section needs to be updated. Concern that it is too buried in the Handbook.
- XIII. It is good to have it in the handbook. Part of a package of maximum visibility. This language needs to get in the hands of the advisors for them to share.
- XIV. Is there any description of what the Academic Life office does? That would help address some of these issues.
- XV. Update the language and focus on other mechanisms for sharing this statement. Don’t need to move to another part of the handbook.
- XVI. This is good information for students to know. Keep where it is, but share more broadly with students. Get it into the culture more than focus on where it is in the handbook.
- XVII. New language is approved, add concern, and place in current location.

Most often if students have a concern and/or complaint about a course or teaching, they should first talk with the instructor. If they are uncomfortable doing so or feel they need further advice or assistance, they should consult with the appropriate department chair or an academic dean. Students may also consult with their academic advisor, who can help them identify appropriate resources. For matters involving a possible grievance, see the section of this handbook on grievances.

- 5. Future Business:**
 - a. Nature Park discussion**

SLAAC Minutes
November 29, 2011
4:05 p.m., Julian 300

Present: Caroline Smith (chair), Sharmin Tunguz, Cindy Babington, Kathryn Millis, Walker Chance, Carrie Klaus, Arezoo Nazari, Dorian Shager, Leslie James, Mark McCoy, Charles Pierre, Jeff Dunn, David Alvarez

- 1. Appointment of secretary** (Carrie Klaus)
- 2. Approval of 10-25-11 minutes, with corrections**
- 3. Approval of revised Academic Integrity settlement form**
 - a. Renamed from “Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form” to “Settlement Form for a Violation of the Academic Integrity Policy”
 - b. Also, references to “second violation” changed to “second (or subsequent) violation
 - c. Carrie will send electronic copy to Caroline
 - d. Caroline will announce to faculty
- 4. Nature Park Advisory Committee**
 - a. Committee is not fully constituted (still needs one faculty member, still needs one student), but has met as a group
 - b. Has named three additional *ex officio* members (1. Associate VP for Facilities, 2. Nature Park Manager/Ranger, 3. Emergency Management Coordinator), who will participate on the committee but will not have a vote
 - c. Committee is satisfied with being an *ad hoc* committee
 - d. Discussion of expectations (from administration, faculty) regarding the nature of this committee
 - e. Potential problem: This committee is supposed to report back to SLAAC, but there is currently no liaison to SLAAC on the committee. Could be a SLAAC faculty member.
 - f. Are changes coming in the structure of committees/advisory committees? Some hints from FGSC, but nothing so far. We ought not wait for any potential changes to constitute this committee.
 - g. Issues for committee arise sporadically (such as regulations re: weddings at the Nature Park last spring), but not monthly
 - h. The University owns and manages the property, so needs to have oversight on how it’s being used.
 - i. Since these issues are fairly rare, couldn’t SLAAC just deal with them rather than creating another committee? Or are we already too far down the road of having a Nature Park Advisory Committee?
 - j. Nature Park reports up through Dick Vance
 - k. Not all committees are necessarily affiliated with one of the coordinating committees. IRB, for example. Seems to work fine.

- l.** Potential problem: Many constituents who may ultimately find they have an important interest in the Nature Park may be underrepresented with current structure
- m.** It could be an administrative committee, such as Dining Oversight Committee and Diversity and Equity Committee.
- n.** But these committees, like committees that do report to coordinating committees (Library Advisory Committee, for example), have clearly stated procedures for selection of members, service on committee, and sharing minutes of meetings.
- o.** Informally structured committees don't tend to be effective
- p.** Can we just say it's a subcommittee of SLAAC and ask them to send its minutes to SLAAC after every meeting?
- q.** What if we go with the draft that SLAAC came up with last year, with edits to reflect different *ex officio* membership?
- r.** SLAAC is in favor of declaring the Nature Park Advisory Committee a subcommittee of SLAAC.
- s.** Ask FGSC for approval. If they approve it, then SLAAC should try to fill the two vacant spots (through a call for interest).

5. Meeting time in December

- a.** If anything comes down from FGSC, we'll do it via e-mail if possible.
- b.** We're currently scheduled for Dec. 13 at 4:05.

6. Service on University Review Committees

- a.** Teaching faculty members of SLAAC serve as chair.
- b.** Thanks to members who are serving as chairs in the next couple of weeks, and a plea—please serve if you can, so that faculty members and students can have a prompt resolution to their cases.

Minutes 2/14 SLAAC

Attending: Caroline Smith, David Alvarez, Sharmin Tunguz, Jeff Dunn, Leslie James, Kathryn Millis, Charles Pierre, Arezoo Nazari, Carrie Klaus

A. Eric Wolf of the Campus Living and Community Development Department reported to SLAAC about the development of a “Greek Expansion Policy” and sought comments from SLAAC about the policy.

SLAAC comments and questions circled around the following issues:

- (1) Whether the new policy signaled a decision by DePauw to expand Greek life on campus.
- (2) What criteria the document contained for deciding whether new Greek organizations should be admitted on campus.

In regards to (1), SLAAC was assured that the new policy did not signal a desire to expand Greek life on campus.

In regards to (2), SLAAC focused on the criteria in section 8 of the proposed policy. SLAAC urged that this section of the proposal be re-written to state that the expansion of Greek life on campus would have to contribute to enhancing intellectual life at DePauw, improving diversity, and fostering community.

Questions were also raised about the actual role of faculty on the proposed committee for resolving issues related to Greek expansion on campus, the proposal’s diction, and the current process for and status of adding new Greek organizations to DePauw. It was also suggested that all Greek organizations might benefit from faculty advisors, and that more robust reporting procedures (e.g., annual reports) would strengthen the contributions that Greek organizations make to campus life.

Leslie James volunteered to join the proposed new committee that would oversee the Greek Expansion Policy.

B. The chair then brought to the Committee’s attention that the revised Nature Park policy would need to be voted on by the faculty since it would change the text in the Faculty Handbook. The chair reported that Cindy Babington, Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students, met with President Brian Casey and discussed SLAAC’s recommendation, which the President approved. The chair will meet with FGSC on Feb. 17th to discuss the proposal and its inclusion on future Faculty Meeting Agendas.

C. Carrie Klaus then provided an overview of the number of violations of the Academic Integrity Policy last semester (25), a number in keeping with previous semesters.

SLAAC members raised questions about typical penalties for second violations (66% result in suspension), the criteria for suspension, and what kinds of historical information about previous URC penalties are provided to URCs.

SLAAC members expressed concern about the slight uptick in the number of violations and wondered if the University was being too soft about this issue. There was also interest in promoting the consistency of URC penalties.

SLAAC urged that information about plagiarism should be reiterated throughout campus life.

Committee members also expressed interest in surveying students about their perceptions of academic integrity policy. It was agreed to proceed with assembling such a survey and that conversations about these matters help to generate community spirit.

SLAAC Meeting Minutes

March 13, 2012

Present: Caroline Smith (chair), Sharmin Tunguz (minute taker), Jeff Dunn, Kathryn Millis, Arezoo Nazari, Walker Chance, David Alvarez, Carrie Klaus

Surveys of Academic Integrity: Carrie found that a lot of integrity surveys administered by other universities are very similar to each other. Many have utilized the Center for Academic Integrity – we may wish to consider doing the same. They have an assessment tool that assists universities in crafting a survey tailored to their needs. Are we concerned enough to administer such a survey at DePauw? For members, the survey costs \$500, for non members it is \$1200 if we use this service. Carrie compiled some common themes from the surveys used by other places. Committee decided we would like to conduct a survey of faculty and students.

There was some discussion on implementing an honor code here at DePauw. Students would have to sign a document pledging to be honest in a variety of endeavors (e.g., academic, respect for others regardless of race/gender/religion etc). It would have been initiated by students. Arezoo indicated that they would be willing to get the ball rolling, but wanted some back up from SLAAC. Rhodes College has the honor code – we may wish to consult their policy and see others as well before implementing one. Students would be accountable not just for their own actions but also for reporting acts of dishonesty engaged in by other students.

If we create our own survey – we might wish to find out about student and faculty perceptions of frequencies of dishonest behavior, severity of punishments, and people's views about what the severity of the penalties should be. It would be interesting to find out about students' perceptions of the prevalence of cheating, severity of penalties etc. Could find out the % of people who think we should implement an honor code. Since there has been an uptick in dishonesty over the last couple of years, we may wish to find out why this trend has occurred. Has there been an increase in student dishonesty? An increase in reporting? A lot of cases of dishonesty go unreported as faculty are loathe to press a charge – what % of faculty decide against pressing a charge? Why?

How do we move forward? The committee decided that a small group of us would contribute questions on academic integrity and pool them together for the rest of SLAAC to discuss at the April 10th meeting. The group will forward our set of questions to Caroline before April 10th. Small group members consist of Kathryn, Sharmin, Carrie, Arezoo, and Jeff. This group will meet next Tuesday, March 20th at 4pm to discuss the questions. Location TBA.

Next meeting is April 3rd followed by the April 10th meeting.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee
Tuesday, April 10, 2012
4:10 p.m.

Present: Caroline Smith (chair), Kathryn Millis, Sharmin Tunguz, Walker Chance, Leslie James, David Alvarez, Carrie Klaus, Jeffrey Dunn, Cindy Babington

Update from Leslie James on Greek Expansion Committee.

- Committee has met once so far to review membership, reporting structure, current policy regarding criteria for admitting new fraternities and sororities.
- There are prospective applicants (chapters of Greek houses that would like to be established on campus)
- Later in the semester, there will be meetings in which prospective applicants will make presentations to the members of the committee. Dates are not yet published.
- Based on Eric Wolfe's visit to SLAAC, it was clear that there was widespread interest in SLAAC in the process. So, members of SLAAC will be invited to the hearings.

Discussion of draft of academic integrity survey

- Move up question #9 (re: possible forms of academic dishonesty)
- Survey should be administered electronically
- Revise question #22; eliminate one "degree" of responses and make fifth column N.A./Don't know/Not familiar with the policy ?
- Revise question #22 to make it broader, to apply to respondent and/or students in general, such as "To what extent [does the academic dishonesty policy] *act as a deterrent* [. . .]"
- For questions #6 and #7, add a line telling them to skip the question if they're not aware of an act (#6) or if they've never committed an act (#7)
- Question #8, first box should be "Never happens" and second box should be "Happens rarely"
- Question #10, change "severity" to "seriousness" (and make all resulting changes)
- Put current question #11 (re: the types of academic dishonesty at DePauw) before current question #10 (re: perception of severity/seriousness)
- Should do a pilot run with the survey before administering it broadly
- We still haven't decided what is an ideal sample size. Anything more than 100 is a decent sample size. So send to all students. Send at least two sets of reminder e-mails. If it's on survey monkey, it should make filling it out very easily. Add an incentive? Something newer than an iPad2? Worry if you send it out to everybody is the self-selection effect.
- What about demographics? Put that info at the end and make it optional.
- GPA and major GPA at the end, too.
- Ask about major, lumping majors into "Arts and Humanities", "Science and Mathematics", "Social Sciences"

- Emphasize anonymity of the survey.
- Ask Bill Tobin or Michael King (Office of Institutional Research) to set up survey
- Before we do that, do a pilot study with a class. Sharmin and Jeff will each give it to one of their classes. Unless there are major revisions, then go ahead and send it out. Add an additional question asking for feedback about the survey, or just ask for feedback verbally (would probably get more clarity that way).
- We hope to have the data by April 24, or if not, by May 8 (last two SLAAC meetings of the semester)

Discussion of FERPA/DPU philosophy statement

- Who's responsible for fielding calls from parents? Staff in Student Life and Academic Life do so much more frequently than faculty.
- Faculty should be able to indicate appropriate contact to parents: Office of the Registrar, Student Life, Academic Affairs, etc. On the other hand, we don't want to give parents the run-around.
- What we need is a guide for faculty:
 - o Inform faculty of where to direct parents.
 - o Advise them of what they can talk about with parents without feeling bad about it (for example, general university policies, classroom policies and procedures)
 - o Suggest that more personal or specific information might be more appropriately shared after bringing the student into the conversation
 - o Not share information with a parent without a student's knowledge, unless it's a matter of health and safety
 - o If you ever feel uncomfortable discussing with parents for any reason, you may refer them to (Student Life/Academic Affairs).
- Take (revised) first sentence from parent guide: "Because of federal privacy statutes and DePauw's philosophy that students are now adults, our primary relationship is with students. Nevertheless, parents often play an important role in the transition to adulthood and may sometimes contact you directly. Here are some ways of dealing with that..."
- Students generally want to be in the conversation. Don't want parents talking with faculty behind their back.
- Faculty generally prefer to work with students rather than parents (though some faculty may be more eager to talk with parents)
- Not just for faculty, but for both faculty and staff?
- Overarching philosophy, but also a guide for faculty and staff (same or different?)
- Caroline will draft something; she and Jeff will revise and bring to SLAAC

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC)
Tuesday, May 8, 2012
4:05 p.m.
GCPA 1133

Members present: Caroline Smith (chair), Jeff Dunn, David Alvarez, Leslie James, Kathryn Millis, Carrie Klaus, Sharmin Tunguz, Walker Chance, Sara Scully (incoming student body president), Dorian Shager

Appointment of secretary (Carrie Klaus)

Approval of minutes from previous meeting of April 24, 2012

Election of David Alvarez to serve as chair of SLAAC in 2012-2013

Report from Greek Expansion Policy Committee (Leslie James)

This committee met and discussed applications from Kappa Alpha Psi African American fraternity and Lambda Sigma Upsilon Latino fraternity. It will recommend that these two fraternities be admitted to the DePauw community, with a number of caveats. But the committee's final report has not yet been written and approved.

These were the only two applications received. Both were student-initiated applications. Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity would be coming in with 5 members, Lambda Sigma Upsilon with 3.

Kappa Alpha Psi already has a DePauw chapter (currently not functioning) with a connection at Wabash. Intends to be affiliated with (NPHC) National Pan-Hellenic Council.

Lambda Sigma Upsilon has not had a chapter here previously. It will probably decide whether it wants to be part of the Multicultural Greek Council (MGC).

DePauw currently has three African American sororities and one African-American fraternity. It has two Latina sororities but no Latino fraternities.

Student members of SLAAC discussed interactions between and among the various Greek councils on campus (Panhel, IFC, NPHC, MGC). Sara Scully, incoming student body president, discussed plans for getting these groups to work together more frequently and more effectively.

SLAAC members raised concerns about getting "beyond the Greek", i.e., not just working together within the Greek system, but including students who

are not affiliated with fraternities or sororities. Response was that campus is evolving, though slowly. Important changes worth noting include recruitment in spring rather than fall semester, expanded senior housing, and lower percentages of students with Greek affiliation.

Sara Scully reiterated plans to work toward more integration campuswide in various ways.

Academic Integrity Survey Update

The Office of Institutional Research had concerns with the survey. SLAAC was distressed, however, that these concerns were not shared promptly with Caroline Smith, chair of SLAAC. As a result, we've lost the opportunity to administer this survey during the spring 2012 semester. Caroline will write a letter to OIR expressing SLAAC's frustrations.

The main concern communicated to SLAAC was about asking students to reveal self-incriminating information along with extensive demographic data. There was also the question of whether the survey ought to go first to IRB, as well as the appearance of conflict of interest (presumably between a member of SLAAC serving on IRB as well as between a member of SLAAC overseeing the handling of academic integrity cases for Academic Affairs). There was a less serious concern about a possibly low response rate if the survey were administered late in the semester.

SLAAC discussed these concerns. SLAAC decided it was, indeed, a good idea to revise the survey's instructions to assure students that answers will be anonymous and that there will be no attempt to link survey data with individual demographics. There should also be a clear statement that, if they feel uncomfortable, students can opt out of a question, or out of the whole survey, at any time.

SLAAC reiterated that the survey would be exempt from IRB approval because it would be purely for institutional research.

SLAAC also discussed the potential removal of some of the demographic information. It was suggested that the survey ought to elicit only demographic information that will be truly helpful in some way. It was not immediately clear, however, which information would be the most helpful. Are we trying to identify groups "at risk" for academic dishonesty so that we can target them with programming? Are we concerned that faculty may be treating different groups of students differently? Do we want only to identify groups with which students choose to align themselves while at DePauw, such as athletes vs. non-athletes, Greek vs. non-Greek? What about the fact that our merely asking for this information serves to create and/or strengthen these categories?

SLAAC was not too concerned about a potentially low response rate, noting that low response rates are always a problem with surveys.

The academic integrity survey will be deferred to Fall 2012.

Finally—a huge thank-you to Caroline Smith for her excellent leadership as chair of SLAAC this 2011-2012 academic year