

Resolution on Promotion of Academic Integrity at the University of Cincinnati

Whereas, at its meeting of June 9, 2011, the Senate adopted a resolution creating and charging a Taskforce on Academic Integrity in the 21st Century; and

Whereas, the members of the Taskforce met regularly from August, 2011 until February, 2012, discharging their responsibility to *“investigate the prevalence of academic misconduct including cheating, ethical and legal use of information, plagiarism, honor code, etc. at UC and to recommend a detailed action plan for strengthening Academic Integrity at UC (this plan should include a focus on faculty and student development)”*; and

Whereas, the action plan in the Taskforce report recommends steps that will promote academic integrity as a core value at UC and educate the UC community about academic integrity; and

Whereas, the Senate finds the inculcation of academic integrity in the members of the university community is essential to the mission of the university;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE:

1. That the report of the Taskforce on Academic Integrity in the 21st Century is accepted by the Senate;
2. The Task Force Recommendations set forth in the report, and attached hereto, are incorporated by reference and the Senate urges all appropriate bodies in the University, including the Administration, the Senate, and Student Government, to implement those recommendations without delay.

Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21st Century Report and Recommendations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Academic Integrity in the 21st 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 21st 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/). 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 ([Xiaoqing, 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 educate. 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 institutions¹ 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.

(¹ 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

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 21st 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	http://oaa.osu.edu/coam.html	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	http://www.indiana.edu/~code/code/index.shtml http://www.indiana.edu/~code/bloomington/discipline/academic/index.shtml	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 http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/G-9.html	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	http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/academic-freedom-for-students-at-michigan-state-university/article-6-academic-hearing-board-structures	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	http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/article_1_part4_1-401.html	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	http://honor.unc.edu/	Committee on Student Conduct (cross-sectional committee of students, faculty, and administrator)	The Honor System, with Dean of Students as initial administrator, handles investigations and hearings. Honor Court hears cases.

rs)

Emory	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/	College-level honor codes and honor councils, e.g., Emory College and Oxford College	Honor Council composed of faculty members and students
Duke University	http://www.integrity.duke.edu	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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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., Gumport, 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.

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

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>