

**SLAAC Meeting Minutes**  
**9/26/2012**  
**4:10 PM**

**Dining Services:**

19 volunteers so far for dining services positions, 6 wish to serve on CSC. The Chair will continue to compile the list of nominations for these positions and will forward list to the full SLAAC committee for consideration.

**FERPA document final editing:**

General discussion about faculty and parents interaction and what the rationale was for distinctions that were made between general inquiries and specific inquiries. The intent is to clarify for faculty what they are permitted to say to parents because they were allowed to say more than they thought they were.

Committee followed up on google docs edits and edited the FERPA document as a group (student instead of child, "academic" relationship or not, other minor edits). Discussion of edits that were made.

The edited FERPA document will go in the faculty handbook and we will have to talk to the VPAA about where exactly it should go in the handbook or look back at previous SLAAC meeting minutes to find that information.

**Academic Integrity Survey:**

The committee examined Carol Steele's PowerPoint presentation on academic integrity and data. Questions were raised about the intent of the survey, how it will be used, and what expectations will be made of the person who collects the data. Identifying students by athletic or Greek organization might be unnecessary. Discussion of whether there is any value to identifying students by race as well. What about race also as a question, what's the value? Pedar Foss collects data every year on this.

*Intent of survey:*

Is there a problem with students' perception of the policy versus the actual policy?  
(Do they have a clear sense of the policy and its specific criteria?)

What is the actual extent of academic integrity violations?  
(The survey might indicate that students think there is a low percentage of violations, but it might turn out that there are more than they think because of a possible gap between their perceptions and the reality of the academic integrity policy.)

To identify students by academic year or class to better target efforts to reduce academic integrity violations.

(Are most students who commit violations freshmen? Or are they upper class students? Answers may indicate that they don't have adequate awareness of the policy or that there is lax enforcement of the policy.)

One goal might be to collect demographic data to inform faculty about groups or types of students that are more likely to violate policy in order to correct faculty stereotypes and profiles.

*Continued discussion on survey intent:*

From the available information, the initial concern was that older students were committing repeated infractions, but the huge jump the committee was looking at was really only three students. Is that statistically significant?

Demographic information could be problematic. Extended discussion of the possibility of profiling students and concerns raised about it. How will the university use these results? The point was made that the real issue might be the need to offer comprehensive reform, instead of the ad hoc policy that currently exists. Some members of the committee noted that the information we had from other colleges was useful and didn't contain demographic information.

The Center for academic integrity has a survey on their website, can we use that? High cost to use and it wouldn't be tailored specifically to our institution, so it is not really an option.

Last year SLAAC had unanimous agreement that information about plagiarism needed to be reiterated all over campus life. The survey came about because of the seeming disconnect between perception and reality.

Discussion of the survey itself and what to strike. Decision to eliminate identifying information (race, gender, country of origin, Greek or athletic affiliations). Continue to identify students by academic year or class.

Committee will continue to edit the survey on GoogleDocs

**Other business:**

Brad Kelsheimer will come to the next meeting with Audra Blasdel to discuss Dining Services contract. Tim Good from the Athletic Board couldn't come today but will come to next meeting as well.

Issue from last meeting about the IM field being used by athletic department, but it is funded by student activity funds. Pressed for space and IM teams don't often get to use the field as Athletic department uses it much more. Cindy Babington volunteered to follow up with Stevie Baker-Watson on this issue.

Students concerned about wifi access and that the university hasn't located dead spots on campus. Carol Smith could come and update the committee but the basic

problem is that the wiring and equipment is out of date and between 10pm and 1am there is simply not enough bandwidth to meet current demand. Could talk to other student reps and see if they want more information on this.

Concern raised by students that there appears to be less outdoor seating and rocking chairs than before on campus.