

**Faculty Senate Agenda**  
**March 8, 2012      SWIFT 500**

Approval of the February minutes	3:30-1
Discussion of Faculty Chair's Report	3:31-5
Introduction of Taskforce Report on AI21 (Adrienne Lane)	3:35-40
Discussion of Report of Budget and Priorities (Daniel Langmeyer)	3:40-4:05
Report of AAUP (John McNay)	4:05-10
Provost Input Session (Santa Ono)	4:10-4:30
Opening of Concurrent Governance Session Senate remains in session and UGSA and GSGA begin concurrent formal Sessions (Harknett, Hagerty, Penzvalto)	4:31-35
Introduction and Consideration of Resolution on ACOPS	4:35-4:50
Introduction and Consideration of Resolution on Smoking Taskforce Report	4:50-5:20
New Business	5:20
Announcements	5:25
Adjournment	5:30pm

There are two reports being introduced at the Senate meeting only one of which will be discussed and two resolutions that will be before us as part of the joint session. I report on our normal agenda first and then the joint agenda items. The supporting material follows my report.

## **REPORTING AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **SENATE NORMAL AGENDA**

#### Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

The Taskforce, which Senate created last year, has completed its work and the full draft report is attached. Adrienne Lane will go over the highlights of the report, but she is introducing it now so that there can be a period of comment subsequent to our meeting via email. Any comments received will then be combined with the report, which will be given discussion time at our April meeting and a resolution to support the report's final recommendations will be offered and voted upon. We are asking that the Senators read through the report and communicate substantive comments to Adrienne by March 15<sup>th</sup>. A final committee review will occur and we will be set for our April meeting at which we will consider formal adoption of the report and the forwarding of it to the Provost and the Vice President of Student Affairs. (The 16-page report is attached below).

#### Budget and Priorities

The Budget and Priorities committee has been reviewing FY11-13 budgets and bring forth two reports on the cost of faculty and on the support of instruction (see below). Daniel Langmeyer will walk us through the significance of these reports. In April, we will take a look at other aspects in more detail including cuts to academic programming relative to other budget categories.

#### Governance Committee and Workload

The Governance Committee completed a preliminary review of the UC Workload document and will be meeting with Karen Faaborg to consider how best to proceed with some committee-recommended updates.

#### OneStop Syllabi Link

When students go to onestop course listings online there is a link with some courses that can take them to the syllabus of the course if it has been uploaded by the faculty member. The function archives the links and thus retains old syllabi unless the faculty member removes them. The problem this presents is if a new faculty member now teaches the course (and the old faculty has left or retired) or multiple sections of the course are offered the syllabi cannot be removed and confuse students. I asked Eric Anderson and the IT committee to examine the issue and they recommend that the function be removed and course descriptions be offered. It causes more confusion than it helps. The cabinet reviewed the committee's recommendations which have been forwarded to UCIT and Kristi Nelson, who was also inclined to remove the function.

## Bootcamp 2012

We have confirmed that most colleges are planning their welcome sessions after the New Student Convocation on Friday before classes start. Arrangements will be made for the Senate bootcamp to be held on Thursday August 23<sup>rd</sup>.

## PCOTE

Howard Jackson of A&S Physics (former VP for Research and Grad Studies) has been involved with grants recently on the issue of teaching excellence. He has been working in part with CETL. I was invited to discussions with him, Robert Probst as Dean Council rep, and Santa. Those discussions have led to Santa creating a Provost Committee on Teaching Excellence. I will copy its charge below. I have been invited not as Faculty Chair, but as an Edith Alexander Distinguished Teaching Professor and a State of Ohio Faculty Innovator awardee. Rich Miller has had a meeting with Santa to discuss coordination moving forward. The committee is advisory to Santa on this issue and if any recommendations surface that would require examining policy change, the appropriate shared governance committees and processes will be engaged. Here is Santa's letter:

"I write to you with a keen sense of purpose and pride to inform you that I am establishing the Provost's Committee on Teaching Excellence (PCOTE). Teaching excellence is at the core of our mission as a public university. It is equally pivotal to achieving our UC2019 vision of becoming a first-choice destination for students and faculty. As a recognized leader in teaching and learning, I want to extend a personal invitation to you to serve on this inaugural committee.

PCOTE will be co-chaired by Howard Jackson, Professor of Physics, and Larry Johnson, Dean of CECH. Its 16 members will include deans, department and division heads, senior faculty and key administrators, as well as ex-officio representatives from CET&L and Institutional Research. The committee will convene in mid-March and meet thereafter on a regular basis for this academic year and next.

PCOTE will be guided by a fundamental question: *How can we make excellent teaching a higher priority at the University of Cincinnati?* If the answer were easy, I would not be writing this letter. The simple truth is that achieving real and lasting change will require your best thinking and your collective action. We must develop a shared understanding of what success looks like; identify the obstacles and assumptions holding us back; determine the best strategies and pathways for affecting structural change; and maintain enough momentum to keep this issue at the forefront of the University's agenda. The work will be challenging, to be sure, but the impact on our learning community will be immense."

## Graduate Strategy Review

The Graduate Strategy Review is nearing its completion and some concerns were raised to me via A&S Graduate Council about process and substance. These concerns were raised at Graduate Council last Tuesday and are to lead to further discussions with the Provost. As an independent body Graduate Council is responsible, so there is no direct role for Senate, but I wanted you to be aware of the inquiry. The Graduate Strategy Review, which began last year as an assessment based on UC2019 alignment criteria, is concluding with programs being categorized as either enhance, maintain, or eliminate.

### Decision-making Taskforce

Jeff Bauer and I are representing faculty governance and we have held three very productive meetings, which have confirmed the principles of shared governance and the importance of faculty senate and faculty representation. We suspect that Senate will be asked to vet the changes by April/May. Again, the president's initial charge of the committee to update our decision framework was set on three principles:

1. Shared governance is working and the basic principles of our decision-making framework shall remain unchanged;
2. We are an academic institution, so our decision flow should make the Senior VP for Academic Affairs and provost central to the framework.
3. With revisions to composition of committees in mind, reduce the multiple 'bites at the apple' that occurs now with same people repeating. Could we have less steps, but actually more eyes on issues?

One issue to consider in this streamlining our connections with senior leadership and the formalizing of the provost connection to senate is the following arrangement: That Senate cabinet would meet first Thursday of the month with the president and the full senate would meet second Thursday with the Provost as the standard. If the president wished agenda space or attend the full meeting or, of course, if an issue needed his presence as determined at the cabinet meeting with him, he would attend the Senate meeting. Given his external duties and our role to advise the Provost, this structure would be more efficient and set expectations moving forward. The point is to seek effective influence and access.

### New Faculty First paycheck

New contracts begin August 15<sup>th</sup> for new faculty. Most will likely arrive August 1<sup>st</sup> because of housing. Their first check will not be provided until September 30. In A&S, at least, there is no set-aside to help defray moving costs. So many new PhDs may be arriving to campus with few funds and having to cover 2 months of expenses before getting paid. Daniel Langmeyer and I raised this issue at FCC and there was some investigation of something called the Rowe Fund, but that will not work in this case because you need to be employed and it can take up to a month to process. Kristi Nelson does recognize the issue as problematic way to welcome new faculty to the university and wants some ideas. There was mixed views on approaching PNC bank to set-up some special arrangement for low interest short-term loans. My inclination is to ask the University to go that extra mile, if for no other reason than to show support for new faculty hires.

### A&S Harassment

McMicken College's Senate Chair Roger Selya placed the harassment module on their most recent agenda. I received the following formal letter subsequent to that meeting, which I am conveying to Cabinet and now to the Senate. I responded with the formal response you see below. Note that Prof. Selya copied the President and the Provost and so I did as well in my response. FYI, as I had received feedback from Senate and faculty across the university I summarized it and had a discussion with John Bryan, who agreed that the module will be improved as we move forward.

22 February, 2012  
Professor Richard Harknett, President  
University Faculty Senate  
ML0082

Dear Professor Harknett:

At its meeting on February 14, 2012, the Arts and Science Faculty Senate discussed the mandatory University Harassment Training that faculty must complete. Although it was recognized that such training is needed and long-overdue, especially if the University is to immunize itself against any liability resulting from both on-campus and off-campus harassment, nevertheless, four concerns regarding the training program were registered by some members of the A&S Faculty Senate, namely:

- The top-down, fait accompli, nature of the decision and announcement to require harassment training at this point in time;
- The seeming coercive tone of the email that informed faculty and staff of the required training;
- The lack of appropriateness of the training module for various subgroups within the faculty and staff;
- That additional training for department heads should be considered

In the spirit of advancing shared governance, the Arts and Science Faculty Senate urges the University Faculty Senate to work together with the administration in an open and honest manner to improve future iterations of the training module. In particular we hope that more attention could be given to the balance of materials dealing with the distinction between harassment and free speech.

Respectfully yours,  
R.M. Selya, PhD  
President, A&S Faculty Senate

---

February 22, 2012  
Professor Roger Selya, President  
A&S Senate

Dear Professor Selya,

I wanted to reply promptly to your letter on behalf of the A&S Senate, which I will place on the agenda of the University Faculty Senate cabinet for discussion at its next meeting in early March. I wanted, however, to let you and A&S Senate know that Faculty Senate has already provided constructive input on how the module can be improved in its next iteration in order to advance understanding of the University's existing policies on harassment and discrimination and we will continue to do so. So, the mechanism for faculty representation via shared governance is in place and already in action so as to produce the objectives set out in our existing policies in this area of concern.

Thank you for bringing the A&S Senate's perspective to my attention. I will insure it is discussed further at Faculty Senate cabinet.

Richard

Richard J. Harknett, PhD  
Chair of the University Faculty  
513-556-3314

### Tenure Celebration

Ryan Hayes and I met and made progress on implementing Senate's recommendation about a tenure celebration. The general agreed to principles are that: 1. An event will commence in September (this will cover the past newly tenured class); 2. There will be a structure put in place to facilitate cohort interaction during the year. I am keeping Jeff Tilman informed and will circle back to the Planning Committee as we move forward on implementation.

### IAP progress

Santa has requested regular updates on IAP progress which we will receive and distribute.

## **JOINT GOVERNANCE SESSION RESOLUTIONS OVERVIEW**

### Advisory Committee on Public Safety

A joint session at the committee level between Senate's Human Relations committee, representatives of undergraduate Student government, and GSGA met with our new Director of Public Safety, Chief Michael Cureton and developed a plan to create ACOPS. Each governing body is being asked to endorse this new committee and commit to sending representatives. See resolution below in section for Joint Session.

### Smoking Taskforce Report

As previously reported to you President Williams has asked each of the governance bodies to vote on the Smoking Policy Taskforce Report, a taskforce created last year by the joint session. The resolution below is in response to that request and is in line with the material that was sent to you last month when the report was circulated. See resolution below in section for Joint Session.

## Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2010-11)

<b>Committee:</b>	Academic Affairs Committee	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Adrienne Lane	<b>Date:</b>	02/22/2012
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	------------

<b>Faculty Members at the Meeting:</b>	B. Reigle, J. Ying, N. Tsurui, A. Lane (Chair) Guests: Doug Burgess (Registrar); Linda Gindele (Bookstore)
--	---

<b>Topics Discussed:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of Agenda by Adrienne. On target.</li> <li>2. Minutes: January 25, 2012. All agreed accurate as distributed.</li> <li>3. Charge—Revisited for purpose.</li> <li>4. Textbook Regulation Update from Doug Burgess, Registrar, and Linda Gindele, Bookstore: Doug provided review of the 2008 Higher Education Reauthorization Act and the mandate that the name of the textbook, ISBN, and cost at the time would be available to students when the schedule of classes goes live for each term. These dates are as follows: February 1, for Summer, March 2<sup>nd</sup> for Fall, Sept 21 for Spring. At UC when the textbook is ordered with the bookstore, there is a direct feed to the online schedule of classes. The first term this was rolled out the compliance was over 60%, since then compliance has fallen. Sanctions for non-compliance are not defined. FSAAC discussed options for increasing faculty compliance in ordering textbooks in advance of schedule of classes going live---these options included 1) designating 'continuing textbook' on order form, 2) only notifying bookstore of textbook change, not a new order each term, 3) individual faculty notification, 4) Doug and/or Linda contact CET&amp;L for inclusion in semester course development workshops. D. Burgess will provide data specific to compliance to A. Lane. FSAAC will consider reaffirming the Resolution on Textbook Affordability January 14, 2010. Doug has requested to attend a future meeting to discuss another potential faculty concern. Adrienne will follow up.</li> <li>5. UC Grading Policy--Update: Group will be meeting again. Has invited W. Lambing and Doug Burgess from Registrar's Office to next meeting. Benchmarking with 15 AAU institutions. Report at next meeting</li> <li>6. Academic Integrity Task Force Update: Task Force report distributed in advance of meeting. Much discussion. B. Reigle moved acceptance of report with recommended changes; move report to Faculty Senate Cabinet and onto Faculty Senate. J. Ying seconded. Passed unanimously. Adrienne will take recommended changes back to AI Task Force. Recommended changes primarily editorial.</li> <li>7. Free Textbooks: Deferred to next meeting due to time.</li> <li>8. Undergraduate Grade Grievance Policy Update: Adrienne contacted Jean Griffin in the Ombuds Office specific to the FSAAC support of the semester aligned policy with recommendation to relook at entire policy due to original date of 1992. Jean reported the following: "The Ombuds office does not have the authority to initiate a thorough review of the Grade Grievance procedure as we do not "own" the policy. Due to our office's informal role in the process, we have over the years undertaken the responsibility of distributing the policy materials and serving as a resource for questions regarding the procedures, however the policy originated from the College Liaison Committee." B. Reigle will follow up and find the 'home' of the Undergraduate Grade Grievance Policy and FSAAC will then determine next steps for action related to content revision.</li> </ol>
--------------------------	---

	<p>9. Adrienne reported that Richard Harknett had shared with her that Provost Ono was interested in a number of aspects specific to evaluation. Thus, Richard was following up and requested information from her specific to FSAAC action and CourseEval. Adrienne shared the results of the survey on course evaluation conducted by FSAAC in Spring 2010 and the following statement: “ A survey was conducted of faculty senators in Spring 2010. At the May 2010 FSAAC meeting, the FSAAC after reviewing the survey results concluded: ‘no further action on this matter awaiting upgrades to Bb and CourseEval. If individual faculty have concerns related to CourseEval and their personal RPT, this should be referred to AAUP/UC’. “</p>
<p><b>Action Items:</b> List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background</p>	<p>Report from Task Force on Academic Integrity for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century supported by FSAAC.</p>

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
<p>Support from Cabinet and move on to full Senate for support.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet  <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)</p>
<p><b>Next Meeting Date? Friday March 30 Room TBA</b></p>	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name. Please send the file to Faculty Senate ([Faculty.Senate@uc.edu](mailto:Faculty.Senate@uc.edu)). Thank you!

# Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Report and Recommendations

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century was formed by the University of Cincinnati (UC) Faculty Senate with the following charge:

- 1) Investigate the prevalence of academic misconduct including cheating, ethical and legal use of information, plagiarism, honor code, etc. at UC;
- 2) Recommend a detailed action plan for strengthening Academic Integrity at UC (this plan should include a focus on faculty and student development).

While the Task Force recognized that a variety of violations of academic integrity occur (plagiarism, fabrication, exception, cheating, bribery, sabotage, professional misconduct), during deliberations the Task Force focused on cheating, plagiarism, copyright, technology, and social media. The Task Force also discussed a separate and strong need to address Academic Integrity at UC as well as the Honor Code. In accordance with the charge, the Task Force focused on possible approaches to developing a culture of academic integrity at UC through education and involvement of all members of the UC community – students, staff, and faculty members - in contrast to a focus on the punitive aspects of violations.

The Task Force makes these recommendations:

- Elevate the values related to Academic Integrity by moving administrative responsibility for defining and promoting Academic Integrity to the office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Office of University Judicial Affairs will retain responsibility for adjudication of wrongdoing.
- Promote Academic Integrity as a core value at UC and educate UC community about academic integrity
  - Promote academic integrity in undergraduate and graduate orientations and Convocation.
  - Promote the statement recently endorsed by Student Government.
  - Teach 'Academic Integrity' as a core requirement in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, with an awareness of cultural and ethnic implications as appropriate. Develop a resource guide for faculty members.
  - Develop a central online resource/portal devoted to academic integrity.
  - Encourage all faculty members to add a statement about academic integrity to all syllabi.
  - Develop an ongoing communications plan for promoting academic integrity.
- Join the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI)
  - Purchase the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide from the ICAI and conduct regular assessments.

# Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Report and Recommendations

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### PREVALENCE AT UC

Academic dishonesty, cheating and plagiarism constitute a problem at UC, nationwide and internationally. Publications and studies on these issues are abundant and may deal with one or more issues at a time. [Walker \(2010\)](#) and [Coren \(2011\)](#) mention difficulties of measuring the incidence of violations of the honor code, namely:

- Studies often rely on self-reporting of dishonest behavior, which may be problematic.
- There is a gap between self-reported plagiarism and the perception of how much others plagiarize.
- Estimates by instructors and administrators are not accurate, because most instances of plagiarism probably go undetected.
- Many incidents are resolved at the student-faculty level and are not reported to anyone at the university.
- Faculty, especially those with negative previous experiences, may ignore student cheating.

The Task Force has relied on an analysis of data from reviewing the literature. This determination stemmed from the Task Force recognition that they lacked both the time and resources to develop a valid survey to acquire accurate and reliable data from UC students, faculty members, or administration.

### CURRENT STATUS AT UC

The current mission statement and statement of responsibility of UC's Office of University Judicial Affairs are as follows:

"The Mission of the Office of University Judicial Affairs is to support the mission of the University of Cincinnati, through the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct (the university code of behavior), educational programs/sanctions, intervention programs and a due process judicial system. The Office of University Judicial Affairs is committed to promoting a safe, orderly, civil, and just community by utilizing the Student Code of Conduct in holding students accountable for decisions and behavior impacting the university community."

"The Office of Judicial Affairs is responsible for adjudicating alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct. The Student Code of Conduct defines behavior expected of all University of Cincinnati students. The Office of Judicial Affairs is committed to changing the thought and decision-making process of students through educational and developmental sanctions that challenge their decisions as adults."

These statements support a central focus of the Office of Judicial Affairs being specific to alleged violations.

The enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct is the responsibility of this Office. Information specific to Academic Integrity and Honor Pledge can be found on this website under the heading of Academic Misconduct. The UC definition of Academic Integrity is as follows:

"a. In pursuit of its teaching, learning and research goals, the University of Cincinnati aspires for its students, faculty and administrators to attain the highest ethical standards defined by the center for academic integrity as "a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty,

trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility." ([www.academicintegrity.org/](http://www.academicintegrity.org/)). Although not all students are subject to a college honor code or pledge, every student is bound by the academic misconduct provisions of this code which are enforced, in part, to assure academic integrity. When dishonest students cheat to gain unfair competitive advantage over other students, they cheat themselves out of a decent education."

At the University of Cincinnati law and medical students are subject to their respective honor codes. All other colleges adhere to the UC Student Code of Conduct. In 2011 the College of Engineering and Applied Science instituted a mandatory honor code.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

*Cheating* is defined as obtaining or attempting to obtain, or aiding another to obtain credit for work, or any improvement in evaluation of performance, by any dishonest or deceptive means. Cheating includes, but is not limited to: lying; copying from another's test or examination; discussion at any time of answers or questions on an examination or test, unless such discussion is specifically authorized by the instructor; taking or receiving copies of an exam without the permission of the instructor; using or displaying notes, "cheat sheets," or other information devices inappropriate to the prescribed test conditions; allowing someone other than the officially enrolled student to represent same. (California Polytechnic State University, 2011)

*Plagiarism* is defined in the UC Code of Conduct as follows:

- Submitting another's published or unpublished work, in whole, in part, or in paraphrase, as one's own without fully and properly crediting the author with footnotes, citations or bibliographic reference.
- Submitting as one's own, original work, material obtained from an individual or agency without reference to the person or agency as the source of the material.
- Submitting as one's own, original work, material that has been produced through unacknowledged collaboration with others without release in writing from collaborators.

Bearing in mind the aforementioned problems with estimating the extent of cheating and plagiarism, the Task Force referred to findings from frequently quoted studies on academic dishonesty, cheating and plagiarism. The Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University recently completed a nationwide academic integrity survey of almost 50,000 undergraduate students at more than 60 United States college campuses ([McCabe, 2005](#)). Findings in this large-scale study were that 70% of students admit to cheating, defined as serious test cheating or serious cheating on written assignments. According to the McCabe (2005) study, almost 40% of the students completing the survey admitted to Internet plagiarism (up from 10% in 1999), with 77% of respondents believing that Internet plagiarism was not a very serious issue. In a study published in 2009 ([Yardley, et al.](#)) 273 alumni reported on the prevalence and perceived severity of 19 cheating behaviors. The vast majority of participants (81.7%) report having engaged in some form of cheating during their undergraduate career. According to the report ([Parker, 2011](#)) based on findings from a pair of Pew Research Center surveys conducted in spring 2011, most college presidents (55%) say that plagiarism in students' papers has increased over the past 10 years. Among those who have seen an increase in plagiarism, 89% say computers and the Internet have played a major role.

According to the survey of second-year medical school students, a history of cheating in high school is a significant predictor of cheating in an undergraduate program, which then increases the likelihood of cheating in a graduate program. Scholarship students were slightly more likely to cheat on tests than non-scholarship students (Baldwin and Daugherty, 1996). Justification for cheating focuses upon the intense competition to get into good graduate schools and to land top jobs, with excellent grades

providing college students a competitive edge ([Willen, 2004](#)).

In addition to overall measures of cheating on college campuses, researchers have examined cheating as a function of academic discipline. [McCabe \(1996\)](#) surveyed over 4,000 students from 30 different institutions of higher education. It was clear from the findings that the more professionally oriented disciplines experienced higher levels of cheating than the intellectual disciplines. This study corroborated findings from a 1964 survey that found business and engineering students to report a higher frequency of cheating (66% & 58%) than language and humanities students (37% & 39%). Other studies have suggested that business students have lower ethical values and are more likely to engage in questionable behaviors than their non-business counterparts ([Harris, 1989](#); [Wood, et al., 1988](#)). A recent cheating controversy, involving over 6,000 prospective graduate business school applicants, relates to online Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) question access ([Lavelle, 2008](#)). In this instance, students preparing for the GMAT paid to have access to live test questions.

## ONLINE LEARNING

With proliferation of online learning it is important to examine cheating and plagiarism in online courses. This topic is covered under "Technology and social media."

## COPYRIGHT

Copyright and intellectual property issues introduce another potential pitfall for students and faculty members. With today's digital environment, copyrighted materials are more widely available than even before (Peters, 2011). It is understandable that a lack of understanding or education about copyright can compound some of the issues discussed above with regard to student plagiarism. It should be noted, however, that while copyright violations and plagiarism may arise from the same act, they are not the same offense. Plagiarism is passing off someone else's work as one's own. It is quite possible to unlawfully include copyrighted material even while properly attributing the work to its source. The principle point of accusation of a copyright violation is the actual unauthorized reproduction of the work, not the failure to attribute it. Some institutions have created departments, websites, or other resources to educate faculty members and students about their legal obligations as users of copyrighted materials and rights as copyright holders. ([Cate, et al, 1998](#)), (Druse, et al, 2003).

## IMPLICATIONS OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Several studies provide an insight into cultural implications related to cheating and plagiarism. Studies have reported differences in the perceptions of cheating behavior among international students. One study found that international students in the United States were almost five times more likely to be accused of an honor offense than domestic students; however, the conviction rate was consistent with that of the rest of the student body ([Heuchert, 2004](#)). In this report, strong norms about cooperation were attributed to the higher proportion of accusations against international students in that students coming from highly collectivist cultures would tend to work together on individual assignments. This rationale is consistent with that of [Evans, Craig, and Mietzel \(1991\)](#), who found that international students' interpretations of cheating were reflective of their countries' educational systems.

A scathing account of cheating among international students outside the United States stemmed from the Fall 2002 administration of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE), with widespread incidents spanning China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and India ([Pendell-Jones, 2003](#)). [Qiang and Wolff \(2003\)](#) suggest that students cheating on tests, engaging in plagiarism, and manufacturing fake diplomas and credentials are rampant practices throughout China's public and private universities. These types of cheating do not appear to be the result of a culture of cooperation, but rather the drive for a competitive advantage. Authors point to a variety of reasons causing plagiarism among international students, for example:

- International students may not have the knowledge of local academic cultures in Western universities ([Xiaojing, et al.](#), 2010)
- Some cultures have a collectivist view of text ownership, believing that information is shared and “owned by the whole society” ([Mundava and Chaudhuri, 2007](#))
- The Asian tradition of Confucianism “advocates open and broad access to knowledge as common heritage” ([Shi, 2006](#))
- Asian students may copy another author’s words as a sign of respect ([Hayes, Niall, and Introna, 2005](#))
- Imitation is the highest form of flattery in some non-Western cultures ([Park, 2003.](#))

Whereas some writers emphasize cultural differences as key factors in the plagiarism discussion, others caution against making assumptions based on cultural background. Gu and Brooks (2008) warned against generalizing about Chinese students, suggesting that “excessive emphasis on culture may result in dismissive attitudes towards Chinese learning practices”. Bloch (2001) recommended that cultural differences be viewed as “ranging along a continuum of perspectives”.

In addition to cultural differences, some authors identify several educational and linguistic issues, which need to be considered in connection with plagiarism committed by international students:

- Writing instruction and requirements vary in different countries.
- “A student from a different educational tradition may be confused about how to be both original and referential in the same essay.” ([Pennycook, 1996](#))
- Students experience difficulties with language and a new form of discourse (academic essay).
- Patchwriting (a combination of the student’s and the original author’s writing in which the student has substituted words or phrases but maintained the structure of the original work) is seen by [Howard \(1995\)](#) as an essential developmental stage for ESL writers.

## TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Technology has become a ubiquitous part of the university. Smartphones, wireless connectivity, and social networking make it easy for students to cheat during exams/tests, if allowed to bring devices into the classroom or exam room. Without strong efforts to educate students about plagiarism, it is understandable that students may copy parts (or all) of an article/document they read on the web. The perception of many students is that everything is free – and reusable – on the web.

[Dietz-Uhler et al. \(2011\)](#) examine several studies related to academic dishonesty in online learning. One of the aspects they look into is forms of academic dishonesty used in online classes. The authors come to the conclusion that definitions of academic dishonesty are about the same in most studies and include cheating on tests, plagiarism, fabrication, unfair advantage, aiding and abetting, falsification of records, unauthorized access ([Stuber-McEwen, Wisely, and Hoggat, 2009](#)), etc. They include Rogers’ (2006) definition of e-cheating in online classes as:

- Looking at another student’s computer
- Surfing the internet
- Communicating openly
- Instant messaging
- Cell phone/text messaging
- Printing off copies of exams and passing them on to other students.

[Dietz-Uhler et al. \(2011\)](#) indicate that [Howell, Sorensen, and Tippets \(2009\)](#) reviewed various forms of technological cheating, such as using mobile phones and iPods, braindumps, organized cheating, and wireless earpieces and high tech radio transmitters. In addition, [Jones, Reid, and Bartlett. \(2008\)](#) list MP3

players, SoundBugs, Programmable Calculators, PDAs, and invisible Ink Pens as additional means whereby students may use technology to cheat.

With regard to the frequency of cheating in online classes greater than in face-to-face ones [Dietz-Uhler et al. \(2011\)](#) mention that there have only been a few of studies examining this question and the findings vary.

“Using McCabe’s self-reported cheating items, [Stuber-McEwen, Wisely, and Hoggat, \(2009\)](#), found that cheating was more prevalent in traditional than online courses. [Stephens, Young, and Calabrese \(2007\)](#) found that conventional cheating is more prevalent than digital forms of cheating. In a study examining the frequency of cheating in online and face-to-face courses, [Harmon, Lambrinos, and Buffolino \(2010\)](#) identified three studies showing that cheating is less frequent in online than in traditional courses. They also found three studies showing that cheating is greater in unproctored than proctored exams.”

[Dietz-Uhler et al. \(2011\)](#) further point out that “the number of studies is too few to make any definitive statements about the frequency of academic dishonesty in online and face-to-face courses. What is needed are more wide-scale studies of the sort that Don McCabe has conducted around the world.” In terms of suggestions for reducing academic dishonesty they provide a table compiled from multiple sources ([Chiesl, 2007](#); [Harmon, Lambrinos, & Buffolino, 2010](#); [Krsak, 2007](#); [Howell, Sorensen, & Tippets, 2009](#)), that summarizes the suggestions for reducing cheating in online courses. Suggestions include, but are not limited to, using multiple versions of an exam, using multiple performance indicators, providing clear cheating policy on syllabus, disseminating information (e.g., cheating policies) to distance students, “honor system, ” banning/controlling electronic devices, cheat-resistant laptops, etc.

## **TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. SEPARATE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACTIVITIES THAT PROMOTE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY FROM THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH ADJUDICATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

The Task Force recommends that the university’s activities that promote values of academic integrity be separated from the process for adjudicating allegations of academic misconduct. The rationale for this recommendation is two-fold.

First, the university should adopt an affirmative goal of assuring that students and faculty members internalize the overarching principles of academic integrity. This affirmative approach is premised on the belief that ethical behavior is essential in order for students to gain the full benefit of the educational experiences that the university provides, and that such behavior ultimately provides its own rewards. It is, therefore, a responsibility of the educators in our community. Exemplars of ethical conduct are essential for internalizing these principles. Correspondingly, listing of offenses and rote memorization of legally defined transgressions does not serve the primary goal. Because academic integrity is a fundamental part of the academic enterprise, the promotion of academic integrity is rightly administered from the office of the institution’s highest academic officer – The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Second, adjudication of allegations of academic misconduct requires respect for the presumption of innocence and the use of due process. An accusation of ethical transgression requires a clear statement of the alleged improper activity, and a formal judicial process that affords due process to the accused. The responsibility of those involved in adjudicating such allegations is not to inspire or education. On the contrary, they are specifically tasked with finding fact and meting out discipline, where appropriate. This role requires a judicial office, with participation of faculty members and students as the stakeholders in the academic enterprise. Effective enforcement of an academic conduct code requires a code that is

concise in its definitions of misconduct. The Office of Judicial Affairs is well suited to supervise formal adjudication of misconduct allegations. Additionally, it is also reasonable to provide for lower level, informal, proceedings that may be organized at the level of college, school, department, or other academic unit. It is essential, however, that any person accused of misconduct be granted due process at all stages of inquiry, and ultimately be entitled to bring the proceedings to the level of a formal hearing, so as to ensure the system's integrity.

Ten institutions<sup>1</sup> that are members of the Association of American Universities, the group to which UC aspires, were selected for a review of their published information about the organization of their academic integrity and academic misconduct programs. The information is summarized in Table 1, with links to their websites. Several of institutions place initial responsibility for investigating misconduct at the college level. In most of those cases, appeal lies with a university judicial office. UNC and Emory (its Oxford College and Emory College) have explicit honor councils and honor codes. It should be noted that although UC has an "honor code" statement in its academic misconduct rules, UC is not, explicitly, an Honor Code student body. At UNC the honor council has broad campus representation and The Honor System handles investigations and hearings through an Honor Court. University of Pennsylvania also has a University Honor Council separate from the Office of Student Conduct.

(<sup>1</sup> The Ohio State University, Indiana University, Pennsylvania State University, Michigan State University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Emory University, Duke University, University of Pennsylvania, and University of Chicago.)

## **2. PROMOTE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AS A CORE VALUE AND EDUCATE THE UC COMMUNITY ABOUT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The Task Force strongly believes that a mission statement for Academic Integrity should be developed, and adopted campus-wide. The following steps may be taken to accomplish this goal.

### **a. Promote the Academic Integrity statement recently endorsed by Student Government**

The UC Student Government in Fall of 2011 passed the following Student Statement on Academic Integrity: "Academic Integrity is a pledge made by the students to personally respect the purity of the learning environment by striving to uphold the ideals of honesty, integrity, and all the while, working to instill these values in their peers in order to promote a fair and rewarding educational community." This statement was reviewed by each of the undergraduate college tribunals, and each provided input to the writing of the statement.

This Task Force accepts the substance of the student-written statement, and affirms that: "Academic Integrity is grounded in a mutual pledge among students, faculty members, and administrators to respect, individually and collectively, the purity of the learning environment. All members of the university community are expected to uphold the ideals of honesty and integrity; all the while working to instill these values in their peers so as to promote a fair and rewarding educational environment."

### **b. Promote academic integrity in undergraduate and graduate orientations and Convocation**

We recommend that both the President and the Provost proudly share the strong commitment of University of Cincinnati students, faculty members, and staff to a culture of highest Academic Integrity at all key university academic events beginning with Convocation and ending with Graduation.

**c. Teach 'Academic Integrity' as a core requirement in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum** , with an awareness of cultural and ethnic implications as appropriate

Student development is a crucial component of this Task Force's action plan. To be consistently applied to the student body, it is critical that an academic integrity skills instruction plan reach all students (both undergraduate and graduate) at multiple points during their tenure at the university. This instruction will actualize the principles stated in the student and university mission statements on academic integrity at University of Cincinnati, and allow for targeted assessments to measure student understanding and application of academic integrity principles regardless of their cultural background.

- **Undergraduate Students:** The Task Force recommends academic integrity instruction and assessment at three points in the undergraduate student experience:
  - First-Year Student Orientation
  - ENGL2089 (Intermediate Composition), or another course within the General Education curriculum
  - Senior capstone courses
- **Graduate Students:** The Task Force recommends academic integrity instruction and assessment during at least two points in the graduate student experience.
  - Graduate Student Orientation (at either university or school level)
  - Near the completion of the first year of study, but prior to a student's submission of the Application to Graduate. Due to variability in graduate program requirements, programs are asked to identify appropriate common times to provide this instruction and assessment.

Regarding the content of the instruction and assessment, the Task Force recommends that a working group of appropriate faculty members and staff be formed to determine a sustainable process for developing, leveling, maintaining, and administering the instructional materials. The instructional materials should be leveled with various academic integrity concepts being stressed at different points in the student's academic career. Ideally, existing content from external sources can be adapted for the university's use. The delivery mechanism for this content will be such that it is applicable to students in both face-to-face and distance education programs. The delivery mechanism should also provide for easy tracking of student progress and achievement (e.g., tie in to course management system).

**d. Develop an academic integrity resource guide for faculty members**

The Task Force recommends that a viable faculty development program related to academic integrity be developed to increase faculty awareness and discussion of academic integrity issues, build a stronger culture of academic integrity at the university, and to equip faculty members with appropriate tools and resources. This program should be developed with the strong involvement of both UC Libraries and the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CET&L), due to their strong relations to faculty development and student learning. The Task Force further encourages all faculty members to add an Academic Integrity statement to all syllabi as recommended by the University Faculty Senate in 2001. [http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/facultysenate/senate/docs/resolutions/Resolution\\_on\\_Course\\_Syllabi.doc](http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/facultysenate/senate/docs/resolutions/Resolution_on_Course_Syllabi.doc)

**e. Develop a central online resource/portal devoted to academic integrity**

To complement both the student academic integrity instruction and the faculty development recommendations that are described above, the Task Force recommends the development of a central online resource at the university that educates and support academic integrity activities and discussion.

This interactive portal should focus on the positive aspects of academic integrity, and be robust enough to allow for active faculty members and student interaction and discussion.

Currently, the university provides only a few central resources to address academic integrity concerns. UC Libraries has developed a number of resource pages for students ([Plagiarism information for students](#)) and faculty members ([Plagiarism information for faculty members](#)), including a page of suggested assignments ([Using information ethically and legally](#)). However, these pages focus primarily on preventing plagiarism and the ethical citing and use of information sources.

Resources with a far broader scope and more interactive functionalities are needed. The Task Force recommends the creation of a diverse working group composed of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty members, and library faculty members to create this portal. This group could be the same entity that deliberates on the student instruction and assessment described in B) above. As with the development of student instruction and assessment, a sustainable process for developing, maintaining, and administering this resource portal is key.

Given the particular concerns related to cultural differences and academic integrity, existing resources and newly-created resources should be reviewed with the appropriate university groups to determine their applicability to the international student's context.

**f. Encourage all faculty members to include a statement about academic integrity in their course syllabi**

The Provost's office, acting in concert with the Deans, may choose to provide one or more examples of statements that would be appropriate for inclusion in course syllabi. The Faculty Senate may choose to endorse both the goal of including such statements, and examples of recommended statements that faculty members are encouraged to use.

**g. Develop an ongoing communication plan for promoting academic integrity**

The Task Force recommends the development of a sustained communication plan specific to the University's commitment to the highest goals of Academic Integrity. In spring 2007 an aggressive and successful Academic Integrity Campaign was conducted on the UC Campus. Our Task Force recommends that the focus on academic integrity have a constant, overt presence. We recommend inclusion of statements affirming the UC Commitment to Academic Integrity in orientation manuals, student government bylaws, etc. We further recommend periodic articles in campus publications such as the News Record and the Provost's newsletters. Academic Integrity should be an openly communicated value that is articulated often and consistently. Although we believe that Academic Integrity is a strongly held value at our University, sustaining it warrants a greater commitment by all those involved.

**3. JOIN THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The Task Force recommends the University of Cincinnati become a member of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). ICAI is affiliated with the Rutland Institute of Ethics at Clemson University in South Carolina. This Center is a consortium of nearly 300 institutions dedicated to issues of the academic integrity. Twenty of the sixty-one AAU universities are members of the ICAI.

The annual cost for higher education institutions with an enrollment of more than 15,000 is \$750. The benefits of membership in the ICAI include 1) sharing of information about academic integrity including policies, enforcement procedures, sanctions, education/prevention programs, research and curricular materials, 2) discounted rates on annual international academic integrity conferences, 3) electronic

listserv and periodic mailings, 4) opportunities for consultation, research, and consortium engagement, and 5) reduced cost in purchasing the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide package.

According to the ICAI website the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide guides an institution through the following processes:

- “\*Evaluating the effectiveness of your current academic integrity programs and policies;
- \*Assessing student and faculty attitudes and behaviors in classrooms, the labs, and exams;
- \*Identifying potential concerns — from sanctions to educational programs — that can be improved;
- \*Developing specific action plans for improving students’ understanding of the importance of academic honesty;
- \*Promoting open dialogue about academic integrity issues on your campus;
- \*Increasing awareness of academic integrity issues among faculty members, students, and administrators.”

Further, the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide includes the following resources:

- “\*Survey instruments for students and faculty members, followed by a confidential, customized report of findings\*
- \*Guidelines for putting together an effective academic integrity assessment committee
- \*Step-by-step instructions for generating or revising policies, practices, educational programs and sanctions.
- \*Suggested assessment and educational activities and questions for focus groups
- \*Examples of codes, and policies from campuses across the country
- \*Copies of relevant reading materials and bibliographies”.

The cost of purchasing the Assessment Guide is \$500 plus shipping for members and \$1,200 for non-members. Specific information about ICAI can be found at <http://www.academicintegrity.org/index.php>

**MEMBERSHIP, Academic Integrity Task Force:**

(note: other individuals made important contributions, but did not participate in writing of the final report)

Ted Baldwin, Head, College of Engineering and Applied Science Library

Joseph Blizzard, Senator-at-Large, Undergraduate Student Government

Anton Harfmann, Associate Dean, College of Design, Art, Architecture and Planning

Olga Hart, Associate Senior Librarian, UC Libraries

Kenneth J. Hirsh, Director of the Law Library and I.T., Professor of Practice, College of Law

Nelson Horseman, Professor, College of Medicine

Sarah Hutchings, Graduate Student Council Representative, DMA, CCM

Jaclyn Hyde, Carl H. Lindner Honors-PLUS Scholar

Maesa Idries, Internal Holdover Senator, Undergraduate Student Government

Leslie Schick, Associate Dean, UC Libraries

Adrienne J. Lane, Chair, Task Force for Academic Integrity for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Professor, College of Nursing

Table 1. Summary information on the organization of academic integrity and/or academic misconduct systems at ten representative AAU institutions.

<u>AAU Member Institution</u>	<u>Academic Integrity Information at</u>	<u>Responsible Department</u>	<u>Administration of Student Conduct</u>
The Ohio State University	<a href="http://oaa.osu.edu/coal.html">http://oaa.osu.edu/coal.html</a>	Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM)	COAM, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, adjudicates cases of alleged academic misconduct. Members are appointed by the senate, the Council of Graduate Students, and the Undergraduate Student Government. Other violations are handled by other offices, e.g., campus police for violations of law, residence hall director for violations in residence halls, director of student judicial affairs for some others.
Indiana University	<a href="http://www.indiana.edu/~code/code/index.shtml">http://www.indiana.edu/~code/code/index.shtml</a> <a href="http://www.indiana.edu/~code/bloomington/discipline/academic/index.shtml">http://www.indiana.edu/~code/bloomington/discipline/academic/index.shtml</a>	Each campus is responsible. <i>Bloomington campus: Dean of Students</i>	Academic misconduct: Dean of Students maintains records. After determination within a school, Dean of Students determines whether a university-wide sanction is appropriate. Complaint process against student is first heard by and sanction assigned by faculty member. Appeal is to dean of school or unit, then is heard by unit review board. Appeal is to Vice Provost. Non-academic violation of personal conduct is reported to Dean of Students, then a judicial conference is held with officer or judicial board. Appeals go to review board within judicial system.
Pennsylvania State University	Faculty Senate Policy <a href="http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/G-9.html">http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/G-9.html</a>	Policy adopted by faculty senate.	First instance goes to faculty member. Faculty imposes sanction, student may accept or not. Appeal is made to campus or college Academic Integrity Committee. If committee finds violation, and imposes more than an academic sanction, case is referred to Office of Student Conduct for consideration of disciplinary action.
Michigan State University	<a href="http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/academic-freedom-for-students-at-michigan-state-university/article-6-academic-hearing-board-structures">http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/academic-freedom-for-students-at-michigan-state-university/article-6-academic-hearing-board-structures</a>	Published under Academic Freedom Policy.	Department/School hearing boards have jurisdiction over academic grievances and grade disputes. Appeals go to University Academic Appeal Board. Different hearing boards for non-academic violations.
UIUC	<a href="http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/article_1_part4_1-401.html">http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/article_1_part4_1-401.html</a>	Under provost	College adjudges charges of infractions. Instructor makes first-level determination and assesses penalty. Appeal is to college standing academic disciplinary committee hearing panel. Recommendations of suspension or dismissal go to Senate Committee on Student Discipline.
UNC-CH	<a href="http://honor.unc.edu/">http://honor.unc.edu/</a>	Committee on Student Conduct (cross-sectional committee of students, faculty, and administrators)	The Honor System, with Dean of Students as initial administrator, handles investigations and hearings. Honor Court hears cases.

rs)

Emory	<a href="http://oxford.emory.edu/audiences/current_students/Academic/academic-success/student-honor-code/">http://oxford.emory.edu/audiences/current_students/Academic/academic-success/student-honor-code/</a> <a href="http://oxford.emory.edu/audiences/current_students/Academic/academic-success/student-honor-code/">http://oxford.emory.edu/audiences/current_students/Academic/academic-success/student-honor-code/</a>	College-level honor codes and honor councils, e.g., Emory College and Oxford College	Honor Council composed of faculty members and students
Duke University	<a href="http://www.integrity.duke.edu">http://www.integrity.duke.edu</a>	Academic Integrity Council	Coordinates undergraduate judicial board and graduate and professional school councils and boards.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PLAGIARISM AND CHEATING

- California Polytechnic State University (2011). Cheating and Plagiarism. Retrieved from <http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/academicpolicies/Cheating.htm>.
- Pew Internet & American Life Project (2011). The Digital revolution and higher education. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/College-presidents/Summary.aspx>.
- Amsberry, D. (2010). Deconstructing Plagiarism: International Students and Textual Borrowing Practices. *Reference Librarian*, 51(1), 31-44.
- Baldwin D. and Daugherty, S. (1996). Cheating in medical school: A survey of second-year students at 31 schools. *Academic Medicine*, 71(3), 267-273.
- Bloch, J. (2001). Plagiarism and the ESL student: From printed to electronic text. *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (209-28), D. Belcher and A. Hirvela (Ed.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Coren, A. (2011). Turning a blind eye: Faculty who ignore student cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(4), 291-305.
- Crittenden, V. L., Hanna, R. C., and Peterson, R. A. (2009). The cheating culture: A global societal phenomenon. *Business Horizons*, 52(4), 337-346. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.02.004
- Dietz-Uhler, B. and Hurn, J. (2011). Academic Dishonesty in Online Courses. In P. Smith (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 2011 ASCUE Summer Conference* (71-77). Retrieved from <http://www.ascue.org/files/proceedings/2011/2011-final.pdf>.
- Evans, E., Craig D., and Mietzel, G. (1991). Teacher and student perceptions of academic cheating in middle and senior high schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 84(1), 44-52.
- Gu, Q. and Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 337-52.
- Harris, J. (1989). Ethical values and decision processes of male and female business students. *Journal of Education for Business*. 64(5), 234-238.
- Hayes, N. and Introna, L. D. (2005). Cultural Values, Plagiarism, and Fairness: When Plagiarism Gets in the Way of Learning. *Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213-231. doi:10.1207/s15327019eb1503\_2
- Heuchert, D. (2004, November 15). *On my honor: Report spotlights cheating accusation*. Retrieved from [http://www.virginia.edu/topnews/11\\_15\\_2004/honor.html](http://www.virginia.edu/topnews/11_15_2004/honor.html).
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/236929864?accountid=2909>.
- Lavelle, L. (2008, June 27). *GMAT cheating controversy grows*. Retrieved from [http://www.businessweek.com/bschools/content/jun2008/bs20080627\\_391632.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/bschools/content/jun2008/bs20080627_391632.htm).
- McCabe, D. (1996). Classroom cheating among natural science and engineering majors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 3(4), 433-445.
- McCabe, D. (2005). *Levels of cheating and plagiarism remain high*. Center for Academic Integrity, Clemson, SC.
- Mundava, M. and Chaudhuri, J. (2007). Understanding plagiarism: The role of librarians at the University of Tennessee in assisting students to practice fair use of information. *College & Research Libraries News*, 68(3), 170-3. Retrieved from OmniFile Full Text Mega database.
- Park, C. (2003). In Other (People's) Words: plagiarism by university students--literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education*, 28(5), 471-488.
- Pendell-Jones, A. (2003). *Academic integrity and the graduate record exam*. Retrieved from <http://www.ethics.org/erc-publications/staff-articles.asp?aid=765>.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2): 201-30.
- Qiang, N. and Wolff, M. (2003, October 8). *Chinese university diploma: Can its international image be improved?* Retrieved from [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Article\\_9\\_June\\_mw\\_2004.doc](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Article_9_June_mw_2004.doc).
- Ling, S. (2006). Cultural Backgrounds and Textual Appropriation. *Language Awareness*, 15(4), 264-282. doi:10.2167/la406.0
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies In Higher Education*, 35(1), 41-59. doi:10.1080/03075070902912994

Willen, M. (2004). *Reflections on the cultural climate of plagiarism*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-fa04/le-fa04myview.cfm>.

Wood, J. A., Longenecker, J. G., McKinney, J. A., & Moore, C. W. (1988). Ethical Attitudes of Students and Business Professionals: A Study of Moral Reasoning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7(4), 249-257.

Xiaojing, L., Shijuan, L., Seung-hee, L., and Magjuka, R. J. (2010). Cultural Differences in Online Learning: International Student Perceptions. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 13(3), 177-188.

Yardley, J., Rodriguez, M., Bates, S. C., & Nelson, J. (2009). True Confessions?: Alumni's Retrospective Reports on Undergraduate Cheating Behaviors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 19(1), 1-14.

doi:10.1080/10508420802487096

*COPYRIGHT*

Cate, F. H., Gumpert, P. J., Hauser, R. K., & Richardson, J. T. (1998). Copyright issues in colleges and universities. *Academe*, 84(3), 39-45. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/232335587?accountid=2909>.

Druse, J., Jarchow, S., White, B., & Wohler, K. (2003). Copyright education at Washburn University. *Library Hi Tech News*, 20(2), 10-14.

Peters, T. (2011). Copyright to the university: tips on informing, educating, and enabling. *College & Research Libraries News*, 72(10), 592-601.

Walther, J. H., ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, W. C., & George Washington Univ., W. t. (1999). *Change in the Age of Technology: A New Look at Licensing and Copyright for Colleges and Universities*. *ERIC Digest*.

Wohler, K. (2003). Copyright education at Washburn University. *Library Hi Tech News*, 20(2), 10-14. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/201534408?accountid=2909>.

### TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL MEDIA

- Chiesl, N. (2007). Pragmatic methods to reduce dishonesty in web-based courses. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8(3), 203-211.
- Harmon, O. R., Lambrinos, J., and Buffolino, J. (2010). Assessment Design and Cheating Risk in Online Instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 13(3). Retrieved January 06, 2012 from [http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/Fall133/harmon\\_lambrinos\\_buffolino133.html](http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/Fall133/harmon_lambrinos_buffolino133.html).
- Howell, S. L., Sorensen, D., and Tippets, H. R. (2009). The new (and old) news about cheating for distance educators. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 13(3). Retrieved January 06, 2012 from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall123/howell123.html>
- Jones, K. O.; Reid, J., and Bartlett, R. (2008). "Cyber Cheating in an Information Technology Age". In: Comas, R., Sureda, J. (coords.). "Academic Cyberplagiarism" [online dossier]. Digithum.No. 10.UOC. Retrieved January 06, 2012 from [http://www.uoc.edu/digithum/10/dt/eng/jones\\_reid\\_bartlett.pdf](http://www.uoc.edu/digithum/10/dt/eng/jones_reid_bartlett.pdf)
- Krsak, A. M. (2007). Curbing academic dishonesty in online courses. *TCC 2007 Proceedings*, 159-170.
- Rogers, C. F. (2006). Faculty perceptions about e-cheating during online testing. *Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges*, 22(2), 206-212.
- Stephens, J. M., Young, M. F., and Calabrese, T. (2007). Does Moral Judgment Go Offline When Students Are Online? A Comparative Analysis of Undergraduates' Beliefs and Behaviors Related to Conventional and Digital Cheating. *Ethics & Behavior*, 17(3), 233-254. doi:10.1080/10508420701519197
- Stuber-McEwen, D., Wisely, P., and Hoggatt, S. (2009). Point, click, and cheat: Frequency and type of academic dishonesty in the virtual classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7, Retrieved January 9, 2012, from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall123/stuber123.html>

## Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2011-2012)

<b>Committee:</b>	Budget and Priority	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Langmeyer	<b>Date:</b>	February 22, 2012
-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

<b>Faculty Members at the Meeting:</b>	Langmeyer, Hodges, Said, Vamadeva, Gilligan
--	---

<b>Topics Discussed:</b>	<p>This meeting focused on a discussion of what financial information we will be presenting to Faculty Senate at the March meeting. Athletics was a focus for quite a while since Chair Harknett has been in communication with the new athletic director who seems interested in our financial historical analysis of nonmandatory funds transfers and expenses and stuff like that. Athletics has received huge investments since joining the Big East and it would be useful to know what has been gained from this investment.</p> <p>Along with athletics (Harknett and Langmeyer will work up a presentation for the athletic director) our report would focus on the resources of the University and how they are distributed; sources of revenues; expenditures (all over time); cost of the faculty compared to revenues and expenditures; drains on general funds (mandatory and non-mandatory transfers). There are also questions not contained in the annual financial reports but sometimes are in budget documents.</p> <p>*We know that we allocate money for things we want to achieve (incremental budgeting for “strategic initiatives”) but who accounts for what we are trying to protect (current operations). Funding for new things has required reallocations of funds from current operations and from the “cuttable” base (colleges and administrative functions).</p> <p>*Investments have been made in utilities (for instance the rather large chillers under the not yet finished football practice field called the bubble) with the promise that they will save money. Is there an accounting of just how much utilities have been saved/cut/reduced because of these investments?</p> <p>*Did the RecCenter really receive an increase in non-mandatory general funds of about \$7M to reduce their deficit (fund balance)?</p>
--------------------------	---

--	--

<b>Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background</b>	
--	--

<b>Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):</b>	<b>By Whom:</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)
<b>Next Meeting Date? March 7, 2012</b>	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name.  
Please send the file to Faculty Senate ([Faculty.Senate@uc.edu](mailto:Faculty.Senate@uc.edu)). Thank you!

**The Cost of the Faculty (bargaining unit) vs. Revenues  
1995, 2000, 2007, 2010  
Budget and Priorities Committee  
2/2012**

We added up the out of pocket cost of the bargaining unit faculty (salary, medical costs, retirement contribution) and compared it to the revenues coming in from undesignated general funds and

restricted general funds that can be used to pay for faculty (Educational and General Income). Revenues may underestimate income because it may not take into account revenues for regional campuses. But the cost of the faculty does include faculty at the regional campuses. So, the % of revenue consumed by the direct cost of faculty may be lower than is reported here.

Between 2006 and 2007 the clinical faculty in the College of Medicine were taken out of the bargaining unit. Thus, salary for the faculty was lower and the medical cost was based on a smaller number of faculty.

	1995	2000	2006	2007	2010
<b>Revenues</b>					
Undesignated	365,468,324	429,000,000	614,871,266	644,969,910	739,927,980
Restricted	163,327,708	156,684,000	270,780,476	278,401,505	309,438,306
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>528,796,032</b>	<b>585,684,000</b>	<b>885,651,742</b>	<b>923,371,415</b>	<b>1,049,366,286</b>
<b>Cost Of Faculty</b>					
Salary	106,826,535	123,073,930	166,226,583	138,715,634	146,755,134
Retirement	15,000,000	17,230,350	23,271,721	19,420,188	22,013,270
Medical	8,544,445	12,000,000	21,067,572	21,732,734	20,258,374
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130,370,980</b>	<b>152,304,280</b>	<b>210,565,875</b>	<b>179,868,557</b>	<b>189,026,778</b>
<b>%FACULTY TO REVENUES</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>19.47%</b>	<b>18%</b>

Interesting information contained in the table above including the increases in the revenues to the funds that underwrite the work of the faculty and the direct cost of the faculty. One thing is clear that with or without the clinical faculty with their salaries and medical costs the percent of revenues that pays for the full time (or represented) faculty decreases over time.

### **Trends In UC's Spending 1999-2010, with a stop at 2009**

Budget and Priorities Committee, February, 2012

Universities are required to file annual financial reports that are audited by outside accounting firms and conform to established rules for categorizing income and expenditures. These financial reports are often used to describe trends in spending and used to compare spending from institution to institution and across institutional categories (for instance, the Delta Cost Project supported by the Lumina foundation for education and others). This report is about how UC's spending looks over a 10 year comparison. We also take it upon ourselves to include comparisons for "mandatory transfers" (debt service). The table below reflects only unrestricted general funds for the main campus. It does not include auxiliaries, or plant funds, or funds brought in and spent under external contracts (restricted funds) or the regional campuses. Unrestricted means that resources may be used for any purpose. The numbers come from the audited annual financial reports for the University of Cincinnati but for the year that classes begin (the annual reports are named by the year that classes end). So, 2010 is actually a annual report for FY2011.

	1999	2009	(2009/1999)	2010	2010/1999
	Actual \$				
	(in thousands)				
<u>Income</u>					
Tuition	160,682	383,882	(2.39)	421,844	(2.62)
State Subsidy	168,133	199,563	(1.17)	199,180	(1.18)

Spending

Instruction	168,021	239,144	(1.42)	230,061	(1.37)
Research	9,118	26,732	(2.93)	30,731	(3.37)
Pub. Service	35,842	50,011	(1.39)	49,838	(1.39)
Acad Support	43,286	67,807	(1.57)	86,497	(2.00)
Student Serv	21,135	38,970	(1.84)	41,954	(1.99)
Inst. Support	35,796	58,053	(1.62)	60,868	(1.7)
Oper&Maint	34,414	49,426	(1.43)	44,659	(1.30)
Scholarships	31,659	64,208	(2.02)	66,365	(2.1)
Mand. Transf.	11,879	46,930	(3.95)	49,115	(4.13)
Total Expenses	391,150	641,564	(1.64)	660,413	(1.69)
Including Mand. Trans					

Just about all of the data are interesting. One sees the changes in financial support from tuition and state subsidies. One sees the remarkable increase in the amount paid for debt service that leaves less money for other uses. One sees that the increases in spending for instruction is less than the increases for overall spending or spending for administration (institutional support). Spending for instruction shows less of an increase than any category of spending save operations and maintenance of the physical plant. Spending for instruction had dropped to 37% of total expenses for 2009. Back in 1999 it accounted for 43% of total expenses. And last year, FY2011, academic year 2010-2011, instruction was 34.8% of expenses. During a period of time when there is substantial increases in enrollment.

It is too bad that the pattern of spending reported here is not unusual for public research institutions. Many have commented on it. And now we have too.

## Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2011-12)

<b>Committee:</b>	Human Relations	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Jean S. Anthony	<b>Date:</b>	Feb. 24, 2012
-------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	--------------	---------------

<b>Faculty Members at the Meeting:</b>	J. Anthony, Chair; A. Woods, R. Kumar, G. Thome, A. Ardehali
--	--

<b>Topics Discussed:</b>	<p>Guests: A. Hagerty, R. Harknett, M. Cureton, UC Chief of Police, J. Corcoran (Public Safety), R. Chatman (Public Safety); J. Parker, P. Penzvalto</p> <p>The draft proposal submitted by the students governments (graduate and undergraduate) to establish an All University Governance Committee Public Safety Advisory Committee was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to an earlier survey more than 80% of the students stated that campus safety is their priority concern.</li> <li>• Students at the Blue Ash and Clermont campuses also view main campus as unsafe.</li> </ul> <p>The individuals present decided that an advisory group to address safety and security issues on main campus was needed. This new Advisory Group will focus on prevention and providing feedback to stakeholders.</p> <p>The proposal will be developed more fully and vetted by the Human Relations Committee prior to distribution to the wider university community for input.</p>

<b>on Items:</b> List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	As indicated in the agenda above
--	----------------------------------

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc.):	By Whom:
No action/decision needed at this time by the Faculty Senate or Cabinet.	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)
<b>Next Meeting Date: TBA</b>	

**JOINT  
GOVERNANCE  
SESSION  
AGENDA**

Be it Resolved, the \_\_\_\_\_(governance body) recommends the creation of a multi-constituency— undergraduate, graduate student, faculty and staff-- advisory committee to the Director of Public Safety that will begin operation no later than September 2012 based on the attached proposal.

---

Advisory Committee on Public Safety (ACOPS)

Charge: This committee will advise the Director of Public Safety on University safety and security issues, policies, and programs. The committee will facilitate communication with the university community and seek to represent constituent perspectives to the Department of Public Safety. The committee will organize a Public Safety General Assembly at a minimum of once a semester, so that wide and direct participation from the university community is facilitated.

Membership: In order to sustain the committee, the faculty and student governance bodies will elect, through mechanisms they establish, two (2) representatives to ACOPS each. The Director of Public Safety will appoint the two (2) staff representatives and appoint appropriate members of the Department of Safety.

Responsibilities of Members: Representatives shall commit to attending the regular meetings of ACOPS, participate in the General Assembly, and be available for consultation with the Director of Public Safety when issues arise between regularly scheduled meetings.

Meeting Schedule: ACOPS will meet twice a semester as a committee and hold one meeting during the semester as an open meeting (General Assembly) in a venue accessible to the wider university community. The Director of Public Safety may call ACOPS into unscheduled session to consult on matters that require more immediate attention.

## **Resolution Concerning the Smoking Policy Taskforce Report of December 5, 2011**

**Whereas**, in response to joint resolutions from Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Student Government, and Graduate Student Government Association passed on February 24, 2011, President Gregory Williams formed a multi-constituency Smoking Task Force to review the current regulations on smoking as per board rule 3361:10-17-06 Conduct and ethics: smoking regulations, and

**Whereas**, the Smoking Task Force conducted a study of current policy and provided a thirty-one page report to the President on December 5, 2011 finding that for the health and wellness of all members of the campus community, the university should prepare to move towards becoming a tobacco free campus, and

**Whereas**, the Smoking Task Force recommends that such preparation include several key steps to insure a tobacco free campus policy will be implemented successfully, including, “reassuring resolutions from the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association, and the Graduate Student Government Association”;

**Be it Resolved**, that \_\_\_\_\_ (name of governing body) upon review of the Smoking Taskforce Report endorses the Taskforce’s central finding that for the health and wellness of all members of the campus community, the university should prepare to move towards becoming a tobacco free campus through the steps outlined in the Taskforce Report. To enhance campus-wide buy-in, once fully developed, the proposed new policy should be vetted through the normal shared governance advisory process.