



Academic Integrity Committee

End of Fall Quarter Report

Committee Chairs:

**Susan Sarnoff, Associate Professor, Department of Social Work
Scott Titsworth, Associate Professor, School of Communication Studies**

**Submitted to Provost Kathy Krendl
December 2006**

Table of Contents

Narrative Overview	1
Background	1
Day of Discourse	2
Chairs and Directors' Survey	4
Outcomes of Committee Work	5
Conclusions	6
Appendix A: Day of Discourse Group Discussion Summaries	10
Appendix B: Chair and Directors' Survey Results	18
Appendix C: Turnitin.com Protocols Being Tested in Pilot	39
Appendix D: Working Draft of Honor Code	42
Appendix E: Draft Recommendations from Student Judiciaries	44

Narrative Overview

Background

During the summer of 2006, Provost Kathy Krendl created a committee charged with addressing concerns about academic integrity at Ohio University. The committee was created in response to two events. First, a former student in the Russ College of Engineering independently alleged several cases of suspected plagiarism in one of the college's departments. Second, a university-wide research project conducted by graduate students in the Scripps College of Communication found high rates of academic misconduct as self-reported by Ohio University undergraduate and graduate students. Because of these two parallel concerns, Provost Krendl created the Academic Honesty Committee to assess policies and practices related to academic honesty at the University and to then make recommendations to help promote integrity and high academic standards for all members of the Ohio University community. The membership of the Committee consists of:

Susan Sarnoff, Department of Social Work, Co-Chair
Scott Titsworth, School of Communications Studies, Co-Chair
Melissa Broeckelman, Russ College of Engineering Liaison
David Descutner, University College
Jayme Feldman, Student Senate
Patti McSteen, Student Affairs
Judith Millesen, Political Science
Michael Mumper, Graduate Studies
Judy Piercy, Residence Life
Dee Dee Riffe, Scripps College of Communication

The Academic Honesty Committee first met in August 2006. Committee members immediately set objectives to guide their work: (a) collecting additional information about academic integrity at Ohio University and at universities around the country, and (b) drafting initial recommendations for action items that could be undertaken by a variety of units across campus. These initial planning efforts culminated in a campus-wide *Day of Discourse*; a survey of department chairs and school directors from academic units; the analysis of university policies and procedures governing cases of academic misconduct; the analysis of other institutions' policies; archival analysis of national research initiatives on the topic; and the initiation of several special projects that could become part of overall University efforts to increase academic integrity.

The purpose of this report is twofold. First, the report summarizes the results of the committee's data collection efforts. In particular, this report includes key discussion topics from the *Day of Discourse* and the results of the Chairs and Directors' survey. Second, this report uses data from these and other sources to provide initial recommendations for short-, medium-, and long-term initiatives in order to promote academic integrity at Ohio University.

Day of Discourse

The initial focus of the Committee was planning the *Day of Discourse*, which took place on September 28, 2006. The purpose of the *Day of Discourse* was to invite key participants representing students, faculty and administration to provide input about the means by which the University should address academic integrity. The Committee identified eight separate topics. Two small groups discussed and made recommendations related to each of the eight topics. Each small group was made up of a mix of students, faculty, and administrators.

The day's activities began with an overview by Scott Titsworth, followed by brief presentations to provide context for the issue of academic integrity at Ohio University, as follows:

Melissa Broeckelman presented a summary of her research findings on academic dishonesty at Ohio University, making it clear that dishonesty ranges from acts that students do not understand as dishonest to behavior that students clearly understand is wrong.

Terry Hogan discussed the current policies and procedures that address academic misconduct, focusing primarily on the role that University Judiciaries plays in adjudication.

Sherrie Gradin addressed the need to train faculty not only to develop teaching and testing methods that discourage dishonesty but also to encourage learning about proper citation, as well as the particular difficulties faced by students who do not speak English as a first language. Dr. Gradin also pointed to the need to teach students to meet increasingly higher demands for citation skills as they move from undergraduate to graduate programs and write theses and dissertations.

Stephen Davis discussed his experience with honor codes in the Air Force Academy and the College of Osteopathic Medicine and discussed the importance of establishing a university-wide Honor Code.

The small groups then met to discuss the following topics:

1. using plagiarism detection software;
2. establishing an ethos of honesty;
3. establishing a campus honor code;
4. creating an online tutorial for academic honesty;
5. reviewing the role of University Judiciaries;
6. developing dishonesty-resistant pedagogy;
7. assessing academic honesty;
8. improving and expanding current efforts.

Appendix A is a detailed overview of the written reports the small groups gave to the Committee. These reports were discussed by the Committee, which then summarized the groups' discussion on the following topics:

Plagiarism Detection Software

Major opposition to *Turnitin.com* was dispelled when it became clear that the assumption

that *Turnitin.com* maintains copyright of student materials is incorrect. The Committee clarified that FERPA requires that faculty obtain permission to submit student material to *Turnitin.com*. A further concern was that faculty may overreact to a finding of a small percentage of plagiarized content, which *Turnitin.com* staff explained does not automatically mean that plagiarism has occurred, as some degree of common language is inevitable.

As a result of the overall positive feedback it received from faculty, the Committee has launched a pilot program that will enable a small group of faculty to use *Turnitin.com* in Winter quarter 2007. Participating faculty will also take part in the *Turnitin.com* Learning Community as part of the pilot, in which they will share their experiences and make recommendations for broader adoption of *Turnitin.com* as well as training and other processes to facilitate its use.

Honor Code

One topic that ranked highly in all of the Committee's discussions was developing and adopting a university-wide Honor Code. Some participants also felt strongly that the honor code should be featured prominently on printed material, be copied onto examinations and papers submitted for grades, and be recited at orientations and other campus events if it is to be effective.

Ethos of Honesty

Although most participants noted that an ethos of honesty was a worthy goal, most also felt that it would be created by effectively focusing on adopting many of the other mechanisms recommended to the committee.

Online Tutorials

There was very little support for the use of online tutorials to encourage academic integrity. Many students, in particular, felt that online tutorials were "busy work" that did not significantly affect behavior, while faculty questioned the effectiveness of such a tool.

University Judiciaries

There were considerable concerns with regard to University Judiciaries' role in adjudicating cases of academic dishonesty. In part, these concerns reflected past experiences of some faculty members who had reported plagiarism and found the process too onerous to pursue. Perhaps as a result, University Judiciaries receives very few reports of academic dishonesty and has far fewer available sanctions specifically designed for addressing cases of academic misconduct than for the much more frequently reported infraction of underage drinking.

Dishonesty-resistant Pedagogy

Faculty members are very clear about the fact that students at different levels should meet different expectations in regard to citation. There was general consensus that the ideal way to teach academic integrity in writing and citation is to require multiple drafts of written assignments. However, faculty teaching large classes find this impossible, and some noted that multiple drafts would be easier to review with the additional time that a semester system affords.

Allowing students to use *Turnitin.com* to ensure that they have not inadvertently plagiarized was recommended as a tool to reduce dishonesty, but faculty also recommended faculty development seminars on dishonesty-resistant pedagogy.

Assessing Academic Honesty

The groups addressing this topic reiterated the need for an ethos of honesty and a university-wide honor code, but also called for the development of tools to measure the effectiveness of all strategies developed and implemented to increase academic integrity.

Improving and Expanding Current Efforts

The groups addressing this topic affirmed the need for faculty to take the time to review student work prior to grading it in order to enable learning rather than to focus only on punishing dishonest work. These groups also addressed the perceived problems related to Judiciaries, but felt that it is the proper place to compile centralized information on transgressions and perhaps to implement an FX grade, which would be removed from the student's transcript after a period of time without an infraction, or after completing remediation.

Chairs and Directors' Survey

The discussions involved in planning the *Day of Discourse* highlighted the fact that the decentralized nature of Ohio University has resulted in many unit-specific academic integrity efforts. Therefore, immediately following that event, the Committee released an online survey for all Chairs and Directors across the University to complete, asking them about department-specific means of encouraging academic integrity. A total of 28 chairs and directors responded to the survey, with responses from all colleges except University College and the Honors Tutorial College (to be expected given the unique missions and structures of those colleges). Complete results of the survey appear as ***Appendix B***.

The results of the survey showed that 82% of responding departments include academic misconduct statements on all syllabi—content that is required by the faculty handbook. Of all practices surveyed, this was the one most widely used across the University. Fewer than half of the units reported using printed materials other than syllabi to address academic integrity (43%); just over a third (35%) of the units reported using such materials to target undergraduate students. Fewer than 15% (14.75%) of departments have similar information on their Web sites. Fewer than half of the reporting departments (46.7%) encourage faculty to address academic honesty in class, and no more than 38.5% encourage faculty to create dishonesty-resistant assignments.

Departments have a variety of ways of teaching students about academic dishonesty, some devoting an entire course to the topic, others addressing it in a course on professional ethics, and still others incorporating it in other discipline-specific courses. Yet only 7% of reporting departments have a policy that requires faculty to report academic dishonesty to University Judiciaries, primarily because most departments leave the decision to the discretion of individual faculty members. Fully 60% of the reporting departments encourage faculty to attend

faculty development programs on academic honesty, and fewer than 18% use any kind of plagiarism detection software. Fewer than 25% of graduate programs reported requiring students to subscribe to a professional honor code, a figure that fell to 6.7% at the undergraduate level. Just over half (51.6%) of graduate programs require students to take oral examinations at some point in their programs; fewer than ten percent (9.7%) of departments require undergraduates to take oral examinations. Finally, only 25% of reporting programs require external readers for doctoral dissertations, and most do not use random assignment of internal faculty members to dissertation committees.

Although the survey identified several areas where greater uniformity might be desirable, there were also areas where consensus was achieved on steps that should be taken. Chairs and directors were asked to rate the perceived importance of several possible priorities for action. The following table provides a summary of those results—averages closer to 5 indicate a very high priority whereas values closer to 1 indicate a very low priority.

Item	Average	Very High or High Rating	Neutral Ratings	Very Low or Low Ratings
Drafting an honor code	4.39	89.2%	7.1%	3.6%
Integrating information literacy into undergraduate education	4.21	85.7%	7.1%	7.2%
Establishing protocols for using plagiarism-detection software	3.75	57.1%	39.3%	3.6%
Making plagiarism-detection software available to faculty	3.64	46.5%	42.9%	10.7%
Providing faculty development workshops on academic integrity	3.61	64.2%	28.6%	7.2%
Altering judicial process to make reporting easier	3.43	50%	32.1%	17.9%
Creating multimedia learning tools for students	3.32	44.7%	28.6%	25%
Implementing XF grading option	3.07	35.7%	39.3%	25%

Table 1: Perceived Priorities from Chairs and Directors’ Survey.

Outcomes of Committee Work

Based on results from the *Day of Discourse*, the Chairs and Directors’ survey, and other research efforts, the Committee undertook several steps during Fall quarter. Those steps are summarized here:

GA Student Support

Early in the Committee’s tenure, it was clear that the amount of work facing the

Committee was significant. Therefore, the Committee requested and received permission and funds from Provost Krendl to hire a Graduate Assistant to support the Committee's work. Courtney Cole, a doctoral student in Communication Studies, was asked to serve in this capacity.

Web site

With the assistance of Anita Leach and Marjorie DeWert, the committee created a Web site to share relevant documents. Initially, the Web site was used primarily by the committee members to plan the *Day of Discourse*. The site is continuing to be developed and will be an important resource for the entire campus community. It will incorporate documents and multimedia tools on academic integrity and links to campus resources and off-campus best practices. The URL for the Web site is: <http://www.ohio.edu/provost/Academic-Integrity-Committee.cfm>.

Committee Name Change

One very eloquent response in the Chairs and Directors' survey discussed the importance of academic *integrity*, a stronger word than honesty. Integrity implies actively choosing to do what is ethical, while honesty implies choosing not to do that which is dishonest. The Committee views integrity as a word that guides and encapsulates its work as well as the University's overall efforts and, as a result, changed its name to the Academic Integrity Committee.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected by the Committee to date, we have refocused our agenda. Specifically, two items emerged as beyond the ideal scope of the Committee's immediate efforts. We are not considering the immediate development of an online tutorial since we have learned that effective tutorials take a great deal of time to develop and by themselves still have a moderate impact at best. Moreover, we heard from participants at the *Day of Discourse* as well as in our own research, that students do not consider tutorials currently employed by the University effective, and students and others consider them an easy but ineffective means of claiming that a problem is being addressed.

Second, we recognize that the creation of an ethos of honesty is a very long-term culture shift that, while certainly important, is a longer-term goal toward which the Committee's other initiatives should help the University move. Whether the University eventually creates an ethos of honesty is more appropriately a measure of the effectiveness of all of the initiatives taken together rather than an immediate goal in itself.

We also note that the decentralized nature of Ohio University makes it difficult to pinpoint specific University-wide efforts that could be undertaken in the short-term without careful deliberation through the normal governance processes. Although there are many excellent practices taking place within specific units, they are difficult to identify and more difficult to replicate.

There are several potential recommendations that, for structural reasons, fall well outside the purview and/or expertise of the Committee. We summarize these, in no particular order, as

follows:

1. Encourage the Centers for Teaching and Writing Excellence to develop and disseminate further their resources on dishonesty-resistant pedagogy, proper citation, and related topics. Because faculty are the primary resources for promoting classroom-specific standards for integrity, the Centers should create various types of professional development options for instructors and explore creative ways to make such options available. One approach could be to create a campus-wide conference, similar to the Spotlight on Learning, and to encourage a given proportion of faculty in each department to participate in training by a given deadline.
2. Encourage academic support services (such as the Academic Advancement Center, the Center for Writing Excellence, and other relevant centers and offices, as appropriate) to make themselves available to help students in diverse disciplines and at varying educational levels understand academic integrity.
3. Develop means of tracking students who have engaged in academic misconduct, including purchasing software to facilitate such tracking if necessary. This includes encouraging University Judiciaries to simplify and centralize the process for faculty to report academic misconduct; develop sanctions specific to academic misconduct; and once they have done so, conduct an educational campaign to encourage faculty to use the streamlined process more consistently.
4. Expand and routinize grade sanctions, as this remains the most common response available to instructors dealing with cases of academic misconduct. One option is to create a special FX grade designation to indicate that the student failed the course because of academic misconduct. However, as several individuals expressed, there should be some mechanism by which students can work to have the grade designation changed and/or removed. For example, the student could have the FX removed by retaking the class and working with an academic integrity mentor to learn from mistakes.
5. Evaluate the impact of the quarter system on academic integrity. Some statements in the 2006 report by Melissa Broeckelman and Tim Pollock suggested that a primary cause of academic dishonesty was time pressure and procrastination. Some at the Day of Discourse even suggested that the quarter system simultaneously encourages students to take shortcuts while at the same time making it difficult for faculty to implement some strategies to combat academic dishonesty.

That said, the Committee has identified several initiatives that can and should be implemented on a broad level. Specifically, the Committee has discussed an integrated approach to promoting academic integrity that emphasizes pedagogy, dialogue, accountability, and culture. In essence, the Committee concludes that an appropriate campus-wide response should emphasize pedagogical efforts that promote academic excellence while at the same time creating key opportunities for continued dialogue among members of the campus community about issues of academic integrity. Only through such dialogue will long-term culture change be possible. While we recognize that there are many good practices within specific units, we also realize that

specific units often exist isolation, unaware of what others are doing. We believe that one of the roles of this Committee is to help facilitate the discussion and sharing of best practices among members of the Ohio University community. At the same time, any university effort must provide mechanisms that promote accountability when instances of academic misconduct do arise. Consequently, the committee is currently focusing its work on the following efforts:

1. A Campus Learning Community has been formed to consider the use of *Turnitin.com* as a pedagogical tool for students and faculty. The *Turnitin.com* Learning Community, led by Scott Titsworth, has just completed drafting protocols for use of Turnitin.com. These protocols aim to maximize the pedagogical benefits of *Turnitin.com* and deemphasize its use as purely a plagiarism-detection tool. The Learning Community will oversee a pilot implementation of these protocols and the use of *Turnitin.com* during Winter quarter. At this time, all sections of COMS 103 and a graduate course in the College of Education will be part of the pilot. **Appendix C** provides the initial protocols being tested in the pilot. As expressed in these protocols, students will be asked to submit drafts of written work to *Turnitin.com* prior to final grading. In instances where *Turnitin.com* identifies a high level of “similarity” with other documents, the student will be asked to meet with the instructor and perhaps others (e.g., the Center for Writing Excellence) to determine why the similarity rating is high and what corrective action, if any, is necessary before final submission. The protocols were written to increase the pedagogical tools available to teachers and to promote dialogue with students about information literacy, source citation, and authorial ethics.
2. Students affiliated with the Academic Integrity Committee and Student Senate drafted an Honor Code, which is **Appendix D** of this document. Starting in Winter quarter, the Honor Code will be discussed at various student and faculty senate meetings, and the Committee will monitor the ultimate adoption of a university-wide Honor Code. In particular, is currently working with Student Senate to create an Honor Council. The initial charge of the Council is to create a final version of the Honor Code and to generate principles that implement and enact the Code. The Honor Code, once in place and supported by the efforts of a Council, can be a critical tool for promoting ongoing dialogue, educating current members of the campus community, and socializing new students about the academic expectations of Ohio University.
3. The Committee will also continue to work with University Judiciaries to help develop means for adjudicating cases of academic dishonesty. Committee Members Susan Sarnoff and Jayme Feldman have completed training and become Hearing Officers for University Judiciaries, and Susan will work with Judiciaries to develop lower-level sanctions for students found guilty of minor infractions or first offenses. **Appendix E** consists of two documents relevant to this process, a draft Academic Misconduct Report that would simplify reporting of cases of suspected academic dishonesty to University Judiciaries, and the second a draft report written by Malcolm Smith, the Interim Director of University Judiciaries, which proposes revisions to his office to enable it to be more responsive to academic integrity issues.

4. The Committee will continue to oversee assessment efforts in relation to campus-wide statistics on academic integrity issues. Melissa Broeckelman, committee member and co-author of the 2006 report on campus-wide academic misconduct, will lead these efforts.
5. The University has already rejoined the Center for Academic Integrity. The Academic Integrity Committee will continue exploring resources available through that Center.
6. The Committee's Web site (<http://www.ohio.edu/provost/Academic-Integrity-Committee.cfm>) will be a site that offers university community members information about academic integrity at Ohio University and around the country, including up-to-date research, recent news, and other multimedia tools. In addition, the Committee is reviewing several texts on academic integrity. In the short term, committee members will post summaries and reviews of those texts to the Committee's Web site so that instructors who wish to obtain, or provide students with, additional resources on academic integrity can make informed choices.
7. We will continue to examine the practices of individual academic units. Our intent is to create some way of identifying and sharing best practices across campus either through descriptions on the AIC Web site or through professional development/student development workshops.

The Committee will continue to meet and work on these issues through Spring quarter 2007, and longer, if necessary. As we undertake these initiatives, we anticipate that several specific recommendations will emerge regarding the Honor Code, use of *Turnitin.com*, and other mechanisms to promote academic integrity.

As members of the larger academic community at Ohio University, we are very encouraged that faculty, staff, students, and administrators are committed to academic excellence and integrity at Ohio University. Furthermore, we recognize that the University is facing challenges similar to those faced at nearly every university in the country. Through our efforts we are convinced that Ohio University can not only address our own campus' concerns, but can also provide national leadership in this area.

Appendix A:
Day of Discourse Group Discussion Summaries

Group #1: Plagiarism Detection Software

While the group generally saw the positive potential for using *Turnitin.com*, they qualified their support with a number of important questions and concerns, which the Academic Integrity Committee takes very seriously.

In particular, the group raised concerns about the copyright of student's work remaining with the student and ensuring that students have a right to privacy even if their papers are being sent to *Turnitin.com* and stored in its database. The group suggested that an important part of turning in student work to *Turnitin.com* is to eliminate anything that would identify the student. Both the group and the Academic Integrity Committee are committed to ensuring that students know that *Turnitin.com* is being used and believe that it is being employed as a tool for teaching and learning.

The group identified a number of important questions about the use of *Turnitin.com* that will affect its efficacy, particularly how it will be employed. If it is used for all student assignments, this could send the message that every student is suspected of cheating. If it's only employed when faculty are suspicious, this could give the impression of favoritism or bias.

On the faculty/staff side, the group worried that employment of *Turnitin.com* might be seen by some as a cure-all for the University's problems with plagiarism. Furthermore, they wondered about the time commitment required to use *Turnitin.com*, as well as the constraints this might pose for end-of-quarter grading. The Academy Integrity Committee's research into these concerns suggests that time commitments would be minimal, but the trial use of *Turnitin.com* beginning in January will provide the best data with which to answer these questions.

The group was generally optimistic about the fact that students could use *Turnitin.com*, but wondered if this would allow students to hide plagiarized work. After speaking with staff at *Turnitin.com*, the Academic Integrity Committee learned that students must wait a minimum of 24 hours after each submission to the site, eliminating the potential for students to change their papers just enough to avoid plagiarism detection. Furthermore, the group noted *Turnitin.com*'s integration with Blackboard as an advantage, as well as the site's deterrence value as a neutral tool for analyzing student work.

The cost of \$20,00-30,000 cost per year was not identified as a major obstacle. The group stressed the importance of training faculty and developing a policy that explains how *Turnitin.com* will be used. The group also wondered whether student consent is necessary and, if consent is withheld, what strategies would document that a student had not plagiarized, including requiring notes, drafts, and other documentation of the student's writing process.

Group #2: Honor Code

The group recommended a University honor code because it saw a clear difference between a code of conduct (which focuses on legal infractions with top-down enforcement) and an honor code (which is a social/moral code which everyone adopts).

This group began its discussion by asking what an honor code is and how it differs from what the University currently has in place. As a starting point to answering this question, the group suggested researching peer institutions as well as the University of Maryland, University of Virginia, and Kansas State University to evaluate honor codes and the way in which honor codes are employed by these institutions. In addition, the group asked the question of how the university can overcome the prevalence of moral acceptance of illegal behavior that lies at the heart of academic dishonesty.

This discussion informed the group's recommendation of establishing a university-wide honor code. In conceptualizing an honor code, the group identified the importance of its being student-centered and student-identified. For example, in the College of Business at Ohio University, students must sign off on every project, test, and paper ensuring that the work was their own and academic misconduct did not occur. Also, because the University of Virginia's honor code is student-run and student-enforced, students have the obligation to report acts of misconduct.

The group emphasized that an honor code should function so that students at Ohio University want to be responsible for their own academic futures and want to be active citizens in their collegiate communities. The code needs to be widely disseminated and broadly discussed in order to ensure its effectiveness. As a student-enforced mechanism, the honor code will be an important way in which students to learn how to be engaged members of the university community.

Group #3: Ethos of Honesty

This group had the difficult task of considering how to develop and nurture a culture of academic honesty—an ethos of honesty. Faculty, staff, and students must come to an agreement about what academic honesty is and then make this a commitment that is continuously communicated from the time a student is accepted to the university. The ethos of honesty should permeate all levels of the University, not just students, and also extend to faculty, staff, and administration. Students need to be part of this process as the University moves forward in order to ensure that changes to promote academic integrity are supported and promoted by students.

Other important components for developing an ethos of honesty include sending students an academic honesty statement, outlining the University's ethos and addressing the statement at

Precollege, Welcome Weekend, and other orientations. The group also identified the enactment of an honor code and honor system as an important part of creating an ethos of honesty. In addition, the group recommended addressing academic honesty issues as part of students' first-year experience (including Precollege, UCC courses, graduate proseminars, etc.).

The group advocated using assessment tools throughout students' careers at Ohio University so that they are continually required to affirm the academic integrity of their work. An IRB-type online tutorial is a model that would work for basic delivery of information about academic honesty guidelines, including examples that apply to different levels and disciplines. This could even extend to potential students applying to the University, where they could be asked to sign off on a plagiarism-awareness form, indicating they've read the guidelines and understand them. Since applications are done online, an online tutorial could be integrated into that process. In addition, a tutorial could be required for advanced graduate students as they prepare their theses and dissertations for submission. The group was not sure who would be responsible for developing and implementing these tools, but suggested that remediation also be included as part of the process.

In order for this process to be successful, the University community must come to a common understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and academic honesty. Different colleges and departments need to agree to abide by common definitions in order to create and sustain an ethos of honesty.

Group #4: Online Tutorial

The group that considered the creation of an online tutorial on academic honesty decided that it should not be the cornerstone of the campus strategy to strengthen academic integrity. While it may be useful as one of many tools to help change the culture, the real answer is to change the culture.

The group was particularly concerned with whether such a tutorial would be effective. They recommend taking the effectiveness of the University's other online tutorials—such as Alcohol.edu and IRB training—into account. From a student's perspective, the group wondered what the incentive would be to learn from such a tutorial. The group decided a tutorial might be better as a tool for faculty to use in the classroom setting, rather than as a mandatory requirement, while also making it accessible to students online.

The group recommended a tutorial that covers basic information for instructors and students and reinforces what the consequences are for academic dishonesty, both for students and for faculty who advise the students. In this way, a tutorial would be a resource for university community members, rather than a "check box" for students to complete.

Group #5: University Judiciaries

This group began by emphasizing that integrity, honesty, and credibility should be Ohio University's core values. There has to be a foundation that underscores a set of core values that students know and understand. Integrity needs to be discussed and focused on, rather than assuming that everyone in the university community understands what it is. University Judiciaries should work to reinforce the University's core values by acting as both an educating entity, as well as an enforcement and punishment entity. Academic integrity requires both education and adjudication.

University Judiciaries could develop a specific strategy for addressing academic misconduct, similar to the new alcohol protocol. If Judiciaries can address this when students enter the university, perhaps subsequent adjudication would be unnecessary. Students want uniformity, and decisions should not merely be left to individual faculty. The University has a policy inconsistency because it allows individual faculty to address these issues as they arise. At the same time, it is important not to take away the discretionary authority of faculty to deal with dishonesty through grading, discussion, and education. There is a need to establish a common vocabulary not just for students but for the entire University, so that faculty and Judiciaries can take an educational role.

There needs to be more centralization. Judiciaries can act as a centralized clearinghouse and communicate with faculty directly. Judiciaries needs to keep open channels of communication with faculty and to make records available. What happens in one college may not be communicated to judiciaries. Even if a faculty member does not find dishonesty, there should be some clearinghouse of information, incidents, and data related to academic dishonesty. University Judiciaries can offer consistency, encourage faculty to go through the process, and track recurring problems. Professors would like a place for all this information to be collected so that repeat offenders can be caught. Judiciaries needs to act as a clearinghouse for information about students' academic conduct while also adequately protecting student privacy. For example, the College of Osteopathic Medicine has a committee on student progress to which behavior and academic issues are reported and centralized. The main point of this group's discussion is that there needs to be outreach from Judiciaries to educate faculty. The use of an XF grading option should be available to faculty.

The faculty perception is that as soon as faculty report an infraction to Judiciaries, the charge is out of faculty control and takes a lot of time. University Judiciaries can better market its ability to educate and mediate and clarify the judicial process for those unfamiliar with it. Certain departments deal with situations differently--a consistent approach is needed across the University. Part of the problem is that faculty members do not go to Judiciaries with all cases of academic dishonesty. Faculty members feel they are not catching every single case. They tend to err on the side of caution. Others professors use the judicial system only if a student denies cheating. Judiciaries needs to dispel myths and do more outreach to faculty. Judiciaries needs to

have a contact person for each college so that faculty members will trust and use the judicial process. Since Judiciaries cannot anticipate and create policies for every type of academic misconduct, a college-based point person could help Judiciaries respond to cases of academic dishonesty.

Group #6: Role of Faculty

This group differentiated between different kinds of academic dishonesty--noting that the stage of academic career (first-year vs. senior) and time in the quarter (early assignment vs. final paper) makes a difference. There is a desire to distinguish between accidental or unknowing infractions and seasoned cheating. Faculty would rather turn academic dishonesty into a learning moment instead of enduring the long process of sending it through University Judiciaries. The group was also concerned about implications of the accusation of academic dishonesty.

Faculty need to promote honesty practices. This needs to be built into pedagogy. The group also voiced concern about the role of "a cop" intruding into the classroom and the importance of consciously avoiding practices that need policing. Furthermore, academic integrity should be addressed repeatedly throughout the term and throughout a student's academic career at Ohio University, and faculty to need to create assignments that make this possible. While assignments that promote academy honesty should be part of core course requirements, academic honesty can't rest in a single course. Professors need to model appropriate behaviors and use case studies to help students understand academic honesty. Faculty need time to help students understand this issue in small groups and one-on-one.

The group considered the role of faculty in helping prevent academic dishonesty, such as avoiding re-use of verbatim test questions. It also considered how faculty can help students with time management, including having students turn in projects and papers in incremental stages and take self-scheduled exams so that they aren't forced into time crunches.

The group also identified faculty development as a highly important goal, as faculty members need to be educated about the policies and processes related to academic dishonesty. While the University must encourage good practices among faculty, it cannot simply be imposed. There should be faculty training for a common understanding of dishonesty, which could be accommodated through special programs or through IRB or ETC training for graduate faculty. Use of software plagiarism detection systems may also be helpful in helping faculty detect academic dishonesty. The University also needs to support faculty in learning how to create plagiarism-resistant assignments.

While there was support for common expectations for theses and dissertations, the group expressed that it depends on what the expectations are. Faculty stressed the need for broad involvement and careful discussion across campus. While the group identified research methods

courses as the place to address academic honesty in graduate programs, there is no similar common basis for the undergraduate experience. Also, while there are high stakes for cheating on graduate work, there is little similar for undergraduates.

Group #7: Assessing Academic Honesty

This group asserted that the key to curbing academic dishonesty is to create a strong culture of academic integrity throughout the entire University community at all levels.

In assessing the culture of academic at Ohio University, the group identified a number of barriers. First, the group identified the lack of a definition and subjectivity that surrounds the phrase "academic honesty." Furthermore, faculty may not always be active participants in creating academic honesty because of the transaction costs associated with doing so. Last, the group considered how to measure academic honesty on campus.

An honor code was identified as a tool to help University community members as individuals and the University as an institution from cutting corners and undermining the creation of a strong culture of academic honesty. The group identified dedication of resources as vital for efforts to inculcate a culture of academic integrity. After implementation of various tools to create a culture of academic honesty at the University, tests and assessment tools should be created to measure effectiveness of intervention strategies.

Group #8: Improving and Expanding Current Efforts

This group emphasized that preparing and educating students about academic honesty should be a university-wide effort. As many methods as possible should be used since different people learn different ways. The group also noted that teaching and learning proper methods for citation, paraphrasing, and other conventions of academic writing shouldn't be considered remedial. It's a process that requires practice, and therefore every faculty member should take time to teach these skills. Instructors should take time to give feedback and grade papers with academic honesty in mind, so that students can learn how to write for their discipline/profession.

However, since some students look for the easiest way to get things done, even if these students receive instruction, the University also needs to figure out how to change such behavior, instruction notwithstanding. One possibility is to create a FX grade (or some other grade designating dishonesty) that is not easy to remove from the student's academic record. If a student receives a FX, s/he should be required to take an academic integrity course. This should not be just a punishment but a learning process for the offender. The group suggested setting guidelines and policies for assigning the FX grade, so that it is implemented consistently across disciplines and colleges. In order to ensure further consistency, the group also recommended that if a faculty member wants to assign the FX grade, the student should either be reported to an

Honor Board or University Judiciaries to make the decision, or the Board or Judiciaries should review all cases where the FX grade is awarded.

The group also pointed out some problems with the current system of reporting academic dishonesty. Since the burden of proof is on the faculty and takes a significant amount of time, the process is onerous for the faculty. Thus, most faculty don't report dishonesty and fail the student on the assignment or for the course. The group suggested that creating an Honor Board or streamlining University Judiciaries for academic dishonesty cases would encourage professors to report academic dishonesty and move cases more efficiently through the system. There also needs to be tracking of individual students and their infractions in a centralized place so that repeat offenders can be caught and taught or punished, as the situation warrants.

Appendix B:
Chairs and Directors' Survey Results

Survey Overview

Description

Initial Survey to Chairs and Directors

Instructions Provided To Respondents

The Academic Honesty Committee is collecting data to determine what policies, procedures, and resources that individual units already have in place to address Academic Honesty topics. This survey will take only a few moments to complete. However, we encourage you to consult with colleagues as appropriate to ensure that your submission accurately reflects the full range of practices in your unit. Thank you for taking time to do this!

Respondent Metrics

Respondents: 28
First Response: 10/25/2006 10:11 AM
Last Response: 11/2/2006 03:00 PM

Respondents

College of Arts and Sciences

Biological Sciences
Classics and World Religions
English
Geography
Geological Sciences
Linguistics
Physics/Astronomy
Social Work
Sociology/Anthropology

College of Business

Accounting
Marketing
MIS

College of Education

Teacher Education

College of Fine Arts

Art
Film

College of Health and Human Services
Hearing, Speech, and Language Sciences
Human and Consumer Sciences
Nursing
Physical Therapy

College of Osteopathic Medicine
Biomedical Sciences
Gerontology

Russ College of Engineering and Technology
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering
Industrial Technology
Mechanical Engineering

Scripps College of Communication
Communication Studies
ITS

Survey Results

The following is a tabular depiction of the responses to each survey question. Additional comments provided by respondents, if any, are included after each table.

Section - Policies, Procedures, and Resources in your Unit

1. Printed materials that discuss issues related to academic honesty.

43.2%	16	Graduate
35.1%	13	Undergraduate
21.6%	8	Neither

2. Web materials that discuss issues related to academic honesty.

61.8%	21	Neither
14.7%	5	Graduate
14.7%	5	Undergraduate
8.8%	3	Provide URL:

Comments/Notes:

<http://www.cas.ohiou.edu/socanth/sociology/links/index.html>

http://www.oucom.ohiou.edu/honor_code.htm

<http://www.socialwork.ohiou.edu/>

3. Require that all syllabi include an academic honesty/academic misconduct statement.

82.1% 23 Yes

17.9% 5 No

4. Encourage faculty to address academic honesty in class.

46.7% 21 Graduate

46.7% 21 Undergraduate

6.7% 3 Neither

5. Encourage faculty to create "dishonesty resistant" graded assignments and papers.

38.5% 15 Undergraduate

30.8% 12 Graduate

30.8% 12 Neither

6. Incorporate a course/courses focusing on issues relevant to academic honesty.

73.3% 22 Neither

20.0% 6 Graduate

6.7% 2 Undergraduate

7. If yes to question 6, please list the course/courses.

COMS 103: Fundamentals of Public Speaking

COMS 215: Argumentative Analysis and Advocacy

COMS 700A-E: Professional Seminar in Communication Studies

ET 501: Engineering Writing

ET 502: Technical Writing Seminar

ISE 630: Graduate Seminar

LING 550: Introduction to General Linguistics

OPIE 573: Introduction to Graduate Writing

OPIE 574: Advanced Graduate Writing

OPIE 575: Thesis/Dissertation Writing

PT 836: Professional Development: Ethical and Legal Issues

SW 384/584: Social Welfare Law

SW 370J: Writing for the Human Services focuses on writing, including proper citation style and ethics relevant to writing

All SW courses cover ethics (for instance, all research courses discuss research ethics)

8. Incorporate content on academic honesty in one or more courses.

41.7%	15	Graduate
36.1%	13	Undergraduate
22.2%	8	Neither

9. Incorporate a course focusing on issues related to professional ethics.

54.8%	17	Neither
25.8%	8	Graduate
19.4%	6	Undergraduate

10. If yes on question 9, please list the course/courses.

CHE 100: Introduction to Chemical Engineering
CHE 499: Chemical Engineering Senior Assessment 1
COM Clinical Skills course; during COM orientation for first-year class.
COMS 700A-E: Professional Seminar in Communication Studies
GEOG 675: Seminar in Research and Writing
HCRM 299: Professional Development
HCIA 299: Professional Practices
HCCF 170: Introduction to Early Childhood Education
HCCF 299: Introduction to Human Services: Professional Assessment
HCCF 399: Junior Practicum/Professional Development
HCCF 400A: Early Childhood Senior Seminar
HCFN 299: Sophomore Practicum/Professional Awareness
HCRM 399: Professional Assessment + others NRSE 335: Legal and Ethical Issues in Nursing
NRSE 602: Research and Evaluation in Nursing
In addition to the SW courses listed in #7 above, SW 290: Social Welfare as a Social Institution and SW 522: Social Welfare Policy and Services I address the history of the NASW Code of Ethics. All courses cover content on the code.
NRSE 602: Research and Evaluation in Nursing
PHIL 130: Introduction to Ethics
PT 836: Professional Development VI: Analysis of Professional Issues, as well as a series of 5 courses on Professional Development

11. Incorporate content on professional ethics in one or more courses.

42.5% 17 Graduate
42.5% 17 Undergraduate
15.0% 6 Neither

12. Incorporate a course/courses devoted to discipline-specific writing and citation.

37.5% 12 Neither
34.4% 11 Graduate
28.1% 9 Undergraduate

13. If yes to question 12, please list the course/courses.

All advanced Latin and Greek courses; many CLAS, CLAR, CLWR courses; HTC tutorials
Art 300J: Criticism in the Visual Arts
COMS 700A-E: Professional Seminar in Communication Studies
ENG 250: Introduction to Textual Analysis
ENG 254: Writing and Research in English
ENG 307J: Writing and Research in English Studies
ENG 280: Expository Writing and the Research Paper
ENG 593: Bibliography and Research Methods
ET 501: Engineering Writing
ET 502: Technical Writing Seminar
GEOG 481A: Senior Seminar
GEOG 675: Seminar in Research and Writing
HCGE 626: Graduate Seminar in Human and Consumer Sciences
HCGE 495F: Human and Consumer Science Honors Seminar + others
OPIE 573: Introduction to Graduate Writing
OPIE 574: Advanced Graduate Writing
OPIE 575: Thesis/Dissertation Writing
NRSE 405: Research: Critique and Methodology
NRSE 600: Transition to Advance Nursing Roles
NRSE 602: Research and Evaluation in Nursing + other courses
PRCM Professional Communication courses, particularly PRCM 150: Business Etiquette (CoB courses, not department courses)
PT 745: Scientific Writing
PT 746: Scientific Presentation
SW 370J: Writing for the Human Services
We don't have such a dedicated course, but proper citation is stressed in a number of courses in which term papers are required.

14. Incorporate content on discipline-specific writing and citation in one or more courses.

45.2% 19 Undergraduate
42.9% 18 Graduate
11.9% 5 Neither

15. Encourage faculty to report lapses in academic honesty to judiciaries.

39.3% 11 Have NOT discussed this as a unit; the decision is left to individual faculty
35.7% 10 Have discussed this as a unit but decision is left up to individual faculty
17.9% 5 Have discussed this as a unit and decided to submit cases to judiciaries depending on the circumstances of the case and student
7.1% 2 Have discussed this as a unit and adopted a policy to refer all cases to judiciaries

16. Encourage faculty to attend faculty development programs on academic honesty

60.7% 17 Yes
39.3% 11 No

17. Employ plagiarism detection software to help students learn about plagiarism

70.6% 24 Neither
11.8% 4 Graduate
11.8% 4 Software Used: Turnitin
5.9% 2 Undergraduate

18. Employ plagiarism detection software to detect student cheating

53.8% 21 Neither
15.4% 6 Graduate
12.8% 5 Undergraduate
17.9% 7 Software Used:

Comments/Notes:

Google (1)
Turnitin.com (5)
varies by instructor (1)

19. Require that students subscribe to a professional honor code.

70.0% 21 Neither
23.3% 7 Graduate
6.7% 2 Undergraduate

20. Require oral examinations at various points in the program.

51.6%	16	Graduate
38.7%	12	Neither
9.7%	3	Undergraduate

21. Use random assignment of some faculty to master's level thesis committees.

53.6%	15	No
39.3%	11	Not applicable
7.1%	2	Yes

22. Use random assignment of some faculty to doctoral dissertation committees.

64.3%	18	Not applicable
32.1%	9	No
3.6%	1	Yes

23. Require external readers for undergraduate thesis committees.

60.7%	17	Not applicable
39.3%	11	No

24. Require external readers for master's level thesis committees.

39.3%	11	No
39.3%	11	Not applicable
21.4%	6	Yes

25. Require external readers for doctoral dissertation committees.

67.9%	19	Not applicable
25.0%	7	Yes
7.1%	2	No

Section - Narrative Descriptions, Explanations, and Recommendations
--

26. Please describe the policies, mechanisms, and/or resources that your school/department follows/uses to prevent and/or react to academic dishonesty.

1. Instructor brings the matter to the attention of the chair; chair and instructor discuss severity of alleged dishonesty and decide whether or not to refer to University Judiciaries; instructor notifies student of decision.
2. Some faculty members employ plagiarism detection software, but there is no departmental policy on this.

1. On course syllabi, we are increasing the frequency of inclusion of the statement on academic honesty provided to one of our new faculty members during the summer 2006 orientation. It would have been nice if that statement had been passed along to department chairs so we could have sped up the inclusion of that statement on syllabi of more senior faculty.

2. The Department of Geological Sciences has a long-standing history of careful scrutiny of Master's theses and Undergraduate Theses by faculty advisors and thesis committee members who are highly conversant with the student research topics and the literature cited by the students in their theses. Because all of our faculty actively publish their research, there is a strong incentive to make sure citations are done properly and plagiarism is avoided. A fair amount of the student research carried out in our department winds up getting published with faculty advisors who have their professional reputations on the line. Maintaining such reputations is critical in the scientific community, so we all have a strong incentive to keep a tight grip on the content of student writing.

3. Although we do not have formal departmental policies on cheating on exams, lab reports, term papers and so forth, our department does have good coverage of this issue. Because many of our classes DO have laboratories, field projects, and other activities in which students interact, our faculty have to be very careful to explain when students are encouraged to work together to achieve team-building and collaborative skills. At the same time, those faculty must also be explicit in explaining when certain parts of the course require individuals to do their own work. Because the nature of the exercises differ from one faculty member to another, they are given latitude to define the parameters of academic honesty as they apply to the particular exercises at hand. The variability in how students must learn to deal with different circumstances gives them broad experience in knowing how to define what is proper and not so. This approach works well. We do have occurrence of academic honesty from time to time, but these are dealt with quickly. On those few occasions that I do hear of problems in a given classroom, I am pleased to see that the offenders do not become repeat offenders. One course correction for the occasional errant student seems to be enough. The increasing numbers of undergraduate researchers in our department take pride in their work while developing a sense of professional honor. That ethic is becoming ever more pervasive, and it serves to raise what is already a high standard to the next level.

4. At the introductory level, many of our faculty prepare multiple versions of coded exams to discourage cheating. Others bring multiple Teaching Assistants into the classroom as a strong observational deterrent to cheaters. Some faculty do both. All of those approaches work pretty well. I still proctor my own exams as do many faculty. Cheaters are usually pretty easy to spot. I have found in my 19 years of teaching large introductory classes that when students do cheat, they still do poorly on exams. This means that in addition to getting caught and having their grade docked, they typically perform poorly across the board. I point this out to them, noting that in addition to the disciplinary action, they are cheating themselves more than they are cheating me. When approached with a certain level of finesse, such students can be convinced that if they took the effort they put in on cheating and funnel that into studying, they would do better. I follow that directly with an interactive discussion on study strategy. Some (not all) students have turned the corner and improved their performance.

Academic integrity policies and procedures at OUCOM are handled centrally due to the nature of the curricula offered, so many of my answers above are best answered by the curriculum office, and not the dept chair.

All assignments turned in require certification that the individual/team has performed the work and that assistance was not nor will be given to others. All examination require certification that assistance was neither received or given or will be given others.

Appropriate levels of collaboration in homework is routinely discussed in classes by faculty. Computerized assignments are used to deter academic dishonesty. Appropriate standards of citation, attribution, and use of third-party materials are regularly discussed in selected advanced courses.

As a faculty, we have discussed the use of assignments designed to minimize the risk of plagiarism. We have designated selected undergraduate courses as "writing intensive", with the expectation that the instructors of these courses will discuss professionalism and academic (dis)honesty. At the graduate level, one component of our graduate program is a series of "Professional Seminar" courses required of all our majors. These seminars address all aspects of the life of the professional, including issues related to academic (dis)honesty.

At the college level, we encourage all faculty to use turnitin.com to teach students about plagiarism and discourage plagiarism/cheating. We also support faculty decisions to use judiciaries.

Frequent discussions in faculty/team meetings. Willing to assist each other in reading material to assess concerns.

I have asked the faculty to submit all cases to Judiciaries. Class specific policies are on all syllabi. All thesis and dissertations are scanned by Turnitin.

Most faculty address academic dishonesty in their syllabi. We, as a faculty, follow Ohio University policy in terms of what is required on a syllabus. As director, I encourage faculty to pursue the judicial system when a student has conducted academic dishonesty. We discuss these issues from time to time in faculty meetings. Informally, faculty alert the director when issues about academic dishonesty occur. We have not purchased any plagiarism- detecting software. I believe that faculty would have mixed views on this -- we want to respect the rights of students as well as standards of professionalism. Some faculty in the School would probably take advantage of using this; it is important that faculty who do understand their obligations to notify students and understand the limitations of its use.

No school policies. Individual instructors typically deal with academic dishonesty through grade reduction concomitant with the degree of offense. It is up to the discretion of the instructor to deal with the matter through grades or to refer to judiciaries. The school director recommends clear discussion of academic dishonesty within classes and the range of outcomes if detected. When consulted (rare), the director encourages ruthless application of penalty. In general, feeling of the faculty is they perceive the transaction cost (time) too high to refer to judiciary. In its new Master's program, the school has graduated 5 students with thesis. Committee chairs are very confident no plagiarism has occurred. In four years, two masters students cut and pasted into class assignments -- they received such poor grades that they were ejected from the program for poor academic performance.

Our instructors and TAs take it upon themselves to be on the lookout for cases of academic dishonesty. When they see something suspicious, they try to verify that it is in fact a case of academic dishonesty, and they also consult with other instructors and the chair of the department to seek advice on how to respond. When the chair hears about such cases, he gives advice about how to penalize the student, and encourages the instructor to report the case to the university judiciaries.

Plagiarism of original works of art is extremely difficult for a student to achieve, especially since faculty supervise the creation of student works from start to finish. Art history courses usual techniques are monitoring during exams for cell-phone use, lap tops are not allowed, students are required to sit one seat apart, TA's continually monitor the exams.

Prevention: monitoring of student work/exams/papers by faculty teaching the each course
Reaction: referral to judiciaries for major infractions, smaller infractions dealt with by faculty (e.g., F grade on lab report, etc.).

Required on syllabi and discussed in class. Situations must be addressed quickly and should be discussed with the Chair.

The College of Osteopathic Medicine has had an Honor Code in place for 2 years. This code describes academic misconduct and how the system will deal with instances of misconduct. See http://www.oucom.ohiou.edu/honor_code.htm.

The Policy and Procedure Manual describes academic dishonesty and the penalties that can be imposed including expulsion from the program and/or referral to Judiciaries. These are discussed with the students when they enter the graduate program. We have only doctoral students, so UG does not apply. Students have a session with the faculty during orientation which includes discussion of generic abilities. If a student is found to be dishonest, the faculty member deals with the student first, but can then refer the matter to the faculty as a group for resolution of the issue. We do have a statement on each course syllabus reminding them of the policy. Exams are checked for suspicious patterns or trends; faculty proctor exams; students are required to hand in copies of references with their papers so that faculty can check the references against what the student has written; we have practical examinations during which the student is examined on an individual basis for knowledge and skills. Students participate in Journal Club and are required to present papers which everyone has read, etc.

Needless to say, the department condemns academic dishonesty at every opportunity. Faculty have statements about academic misconduct on their syllabi; teach about plagiarism, citation rules, etc. in classes; the Department Web site has information on these issues; we discuss problems collectively in faculty meetings; and so forth.

Up to the individual instructor in courses taught to undergrads and graduate students. Graduate assistants sometimes use software to detect academic dishonesty, but this is not consistently carried out. Regarding filmmaking (like other visual arts), referencing past filmmakers is not necessarily considered a form of academic dishonesty.

We are currently in the process of discussing this and are considering an on-line program to check papers. Some faculty include information on syllabi. Not all faculty are doing this.

We are presently engaged in a departmental risk assessment process to review and update our policies and determine allocation of resources. See our Web site at http://www.ent.ohiou.edu/~kremer/ChairStuff/MEDept_RMP.html for details.

We foster a culture that regards cheating as a threat to the very foundations of the academic enterprise. Faculty are required to state their policy on academic honesty on course syllabi. Faculty are encouraged on an individual basis to create assignments that deter cheating.

We have a no-tolerance policy, which is included in every syllabus. Any plagiarism results in an F for the course and referral to judiciaries. We include thorough training on plagiarism in our 3-day orientation for all M.A., Au.D. and Ph.D. students. Also, every graduate student signs an agreement to comply with our "generic abilities" guidelines, which address various aspects of

professional conduct. Our probation policy allows for program dismissal for infractions of professional conduct. We are clear with graduate students that academic grades alone are not sufficient to warrant continuation in the program if there are other serious concerns.

We have been in the process of developing a code of ethics for faculty and students over the last two years and are about to adopt it. We have recommended statements that we add assignments, tests, and group activities where students sign to indicate the originality of the work. We use Turnitin.com extensively for all assignments across most courses and the M.B.A. program.

We have previously treated academic honesty as something they would "get" somewhere else and come to us with. We typically have smaller classes and know students by name, and have the perception that we don't have a real problem. Recent events have highlighted the fact that in many cases, we do have a problem, not with people willfully disregarding the standards, but with people being ignorant of the standards. To date, most discussions of academic and professional integrity have been informal, ad hoc, almost casual. Exceptions would be in CHE 100 and 499 (freshmen and senior courses focusing on professional ethics). We have now added significant discussion of academic and professional integrity to our graduate seminar (CHE 691), which is required of all graduate students every quarter. I have just ordered a copy of the Rowman and Littlefield Guide to Writing with Sources for each of our graduate students and faculty. Academic and professional integrity has now become a regular feature of our weekly faculty meeting discussions. I expect that in future we will address it more specifically in a variety of courses.

We inform students upon admission that they must adhere to our professional code of ethics or risk being unable to sit for the licensing exam in any state. We have a department specific Academic Honesty statement on every syllabus, and most of our courses are linked to field placements; therefore, by making assignments that incorporate field work, we ensure that students cannot buy papers relevant to their assignments or cut and paste them from the internet.

27. Are there particular actions you would like to see the university take to assist in encouraging academic honesty?

1. develop an honor code.
2. streamline and clean up the judiciaries process so that faculty do not feel punished for using it, which currently is the case.
3. make materials on academic honesty, plagiarism, etc. easily accessible and understandable on a Web site.
4. develop a common understanding (or at least a dialogue) across disciplines on what is considered dishonest.

A clear set of definitions and expectations for students, emphasized from orientation through graduation.

A required 1 or 2 hour course that covers professional and academic ethics -- separate courses for graduate and undergraduate.

At one point, my unit had a site license for "Turnitin.com". We eventually decided that we did not have a sufficient number of faculty members using this site to warrant the expense. Personally, I would like for the University to have a site license. I think I have a better understanding, now, of how it might be used as a learning opportunity for students rather than simply as a threat mechanism.

Code of honor.

Cover in all classes. Much better junior English program, not taught by grad students.

Develop an honor code.

Encourage or require faculty to place an academic quality/plagiarism statement on syllabi; cultivate a "culture of honesty" on campus (easier said than done!); initiate a student honor code which all students would be required to sign upon admittance to the university; require students to take a course that teaches correct research methods and citation, etc., as part of the general education process.

I like the idea of an honor code regarding academic honesty.

I think that infusing an ethos of honesty is the most important, one that must be reiterated through other means, but must override all and be included in all aspects of the institution.

I think the University must take a hard-line stance with persons who violate academic honesty policies so that it becomes known that there is zero tolerance for that type of behavior. Accountability is the standard that must be met. Persons who encourage it or allow it to happen under their watch should be penalized by dismissal in most cases. The university should assist units in procuring the materials that can detect plagiarism, rather than merely suggesting it.

I would like the university to adopt certain mandatory penalties for cases of academic dishonesty so that the instructor doesn't have to take that burden and its consequences on himself/herself.

I would like to see the development of a university-wide honor code.

I would like to see the word honesty replaced by the word integrity. Integrity is a much stronger and far-reaching term. Honesty is insufficient. Is it okay to do wrong so long as you don't lie about it? I think not. We should aspire to integrity, not just honesty. I would like to have a more

clear understanding of what the procedures in Judiciaries are. For example, I have heard that you can "report" instead of refer. I would like to know about the standard of evidence used and to see summary reports on an annual basis that shows cases, decisions, and sanctions. Often faculty seem to be reluctant to refer or report because they think the offense is too minor to warrant expulsion or because they expect the sanction will be minor compared to the offense. The same faculty member can hold these apparently contradictory ideas. It would be helpful to have a better idea of what the system does with cases. I would like to see more open discussion of academic and professional integrity among faculty and administration. I am finding that the most effective way to get these discussions going is either with case studies or with "true confessions," which starts with the highest-ranking person in the room revealing a past action he/she is not proud of or still feels conflicted about. Typically other people will then confess as well, and a consensus will gradually build on where the lines should be drawn. There seems to be an atmosphere that no one should ever admit a mistake that makes it difficult to hold a real conversation.

I'd like software readily available. I'd like to see an honor code. Ohio University, in its straining effort for 'national prominence', encourages the community as a whole to cut corners. The end justifies the means?

It might be worthwhile to explore the possibility of a campus-wide honor code. At Oberlin, we signed an honor pledge which I still remember after 26 years. "I have neither given nor received aid on this examination" is a phrase that is automatic when I think about cheating and plagiarism. I do not favor introduction of plagiarism detection software. This is best kept as a human-controlled issue. In our department, such an approach would be redundant and not as effective as what is already in place. The honor code would be an important step in helping students achieve a higher level of personal responsibility across the board, which would be a nice thing to see at Ohio University.

More flexible judiciary policy. Many faculty are reluctant to send a case to judiciaries because they think that the response (at least for first/minor infractions) may be too severe.

More TA support

No (5)

Smaller classes

We have no software for checking on plagiarism and no training on how to use such software.

Would like to see the university buy a site license for checking students papers.

28. What resources would you like to have to assist you (and others) to encourage academic honesty?

Better training for students on expectations at all levels and in all disciplines; more training for faculty on preventing, detecting and dealing with academic dishonesty.

clear policies and procedures; honor code

I do think that a University honor code would be a good idea. A properly developed vehicle might be one mechanism for beginning to address a number of persistent problems evident in the OU culture.

I would like to see people come in to lead workshops on specific things we can do to encourage academic integrity. I would like to see more faculty attend the Conference on Academic Integrity, which I went to last week and which was very informative and motivating. I would like to have access to Turnitin to use with my students, as a tool to discuss what might be perceived as plagiarism and what is the best practice. I am very concerned about the use of Turnitin as a "secret weapon" for policing and punishment. I saw very low morale and bad attitudes among students and faculty last week at the University of Colorado, resulting from a perception that the Honor Code and Turnitin were all about policing and punishment and not about teaching and learning.

More TA support

None (6)

Our Dean is a very strong advocate of the Honor Code, so we have the support we need in our college.

Plagiarism detection software;
workshops;
a "streamlined" judiciaries process;
a codified "hierarchy" of plagiarism definitions, from mild to severe, with appropriate levels of punishment

Plagiarism software.

Question #33 below is a good idea. That is, allow faculty to report cases of academic dishonesty without charging students with a violation of the student code of conduct. We all know that to "win" a case in the judicial process requires overwhelming evidence, to the point that many faculty probably don't bother submitting cases. However, question 33 provides some leverage on cheaters and helps to establish repeat offenders. Any single case in the judiciaries could be

dismissed as a misunderstanding, and that is perhaps as it should be. Question 33 is, I think, helpful.

Rigorous discipline-specific courses in technical writing at the undergraduate and graduate level that clearly address the complexities of academically honest writing.

See 27 above plus a site license to plagiarism detection software.

Software for checking for plagiarism and training on how to use it.

Some faculty would like access to plagiarism detection software; others wouldn't use it. Personally, I believe the breakneck pace of quarters contribute to the problem--but I can't say we've talked about this as a department. The immense burdens on faculty time make it difficult to detect and deal with instances of plagiarism. If faculty had less to do, they could concentrate more energy on this.

Some program for all and a remedial program for first-time offenders. Listing of times where any ethics failure occurred.

Some sort of university-wide policy (rather than leaving it up to individual departments or Colleges).

Stronger Judiciaries, staff to help run plagiarism software for all written assignments.

The software to detect plagiarism.

University-wide license to Turnitin

We need someone to whom we can submit student work for verification of academic honesty. We don't have the time to do this ourselves.

Web site, standardized materials available to use to talk with students.

Section - Priorities for the University

29. Making plagiarism detection software available for use by faculty and students.

28.6% 8 Very High
17.9% 5 High
42.9% 12 Neutral
10.7% 3 Low

Mean: 3.6429

30. Establishing protocols for using plagiarism detection software.

21.4% 6 Very High
35.7% 10 High
39.3% 11 Neutral
3.6% 1 Low

Mean: 3.7500

31. Drafting an honor code.

57.1% 16 Very High
32.1% 9 High
7.1% 2 Neutral
3.6% 1 Very low

Mean: 4.3929

32. Creating multimedia tools to help students learn about academic ethics.

17.9% 5 Very High
28.6% 8 High
28.6% 8 Neutral
17.9% 5 Low
7.1% 2 Very low

Mean: 3.3214

33. Altering the judicial process to allow faculty to report cases of academic dishonesty without charging students with a violation of the student code of conduct.

14.3% 4 Very High
35.7% 10 High
32.1% 9 Neutral
14.3% 4 Low
3.6% 1 Very low

Mean: 3.4286

34. Implementing an "FX" grade to indicate that the student failed the class because of academic misconduct.

7.1%	2	Very High
28.6%	8	High
39.3%	11	Neutral
14.3%	4	Low
10.7%	3	Very low

Mean: 3.0714

35. Integrating information literacy and instruction on source citation more strongly into general education.

46.4%	13	Very High
39.3%	11	High
7.1%	2	Neutral
3.6%	1	Low
3.6%	1	Very low

Mean: 4.2143

36. Developing faculty development workshops showing faculty how to prevent and/or detect academic dishonesty.

7.1%	2	Very High
57.1%	16	High
28.6%	8	Neutral
3.6%	1	Low
3.6%	1	Very low

Mean: 3.6071

37. Is there anything else, from the standpoint of your school/department, that you would like the Academic Honesty Committee to consider with respect to these or other issues related to academic honesty?

Clear definitions of faculty responsibility, TA or grader responsibility, student responsibility, department and college responsibility, etc.

I think the first priority is to define academic honesty, and the second priority is to educate the university community about what it means.

Many of my faculty colleagues are sometimes worried about reporting cases of "mild" plagiarism for fear of becoming bogged down in a very slow-moving and awkward judiciaries

process; many also do not want to ruin someone's career over "mild" cases of plagiarism and therefore do not want to report it to judiciaries.

More service learning and other hands-on civic engagement. They offer many benefits to the university, among them writing assignments that are plagiarism-resistant.

Much of what I would have said here is already discussed in the response to question #26. However, I would add that for many of the questions in the first part of the survey (e.g. questions 1-17), many of our faculty are dealing with these issues on an individual basis. Just because our department does not have formalized policies on these points does not mean we do not take it seriously. Our department is small. Communication flows quickly. We have close contact with our students. In line with much of the discussion under question #26, we maintain pretty tight control over the academic honesty issue in our department. However, if it is felt by the University that departments need to have defined policies on the academic honesty/plagiarism issue, we have no objection to developing one.

no (7)

Regarding the FX grade, there should be a way to "work off" one FX. The FX should not be applied to offenses that occurred before it existed. The Honor Code and related policies must include a path to redemption, and the idea that each day is another opportunity to act with integrity. I am concerned that we focus on personal responsibility rather than avoidance of punishment. Regarding information literacy and general education, there are often discipline-specific guidelines at higher levels, and I think one of the problems we have now is that faculty *think* students "already got that" in English 151. What we need is an emphasis on teaching students and holding individuals responsible at ALL levels. Regarding multimedia tools, I am concerned that it feeds the impression that academic integrity is someone else's responsibility. It was clear from what I saw at the Conference on Academic Integrity that a culture of integrity is best built by a large number of individual and small group discussions. Students look to their peers and their faculty for guidance on what is right; faculty and staff look to their peers and their immediate supervisors. Judiciaries may need an overhaul to be in line with best practices. It may be time to ask for help with a system-wide evaluation from the Center for Academic Integrity.

There are two distinct different issues: 1. cheating 2. plagiarism When it comes to developing an approach -- one size does not fit both problems.

This is something that the whole university needs to take ownership of. It cannot simply be addressed in General Education courses, but needs to become part of major curricula. We cannot be naive enough to think that adding a unit or learning outcome on this in freshmen composition or j-courses is going to solve the problem. I would like to see the emphasis placed upon the creation of "dishonesty-resistant" assignments and the creation of reasonable workloads for

faculty and students. I hope we don't over-emphasize the possible benefits of software. It strikes me as a solution similar to building more prisons to fight crime. It may have a partial deterrent effect, but it's not going to be nearly as effective as cutting down on workload and changing values.

Appendix C:
Turnitin.com Protocols Being Tested in Pilot

Ohio University has entered into an agreement with iParadigms Software to conduct a trial study of Turnitin.com for use as an enterprise-level educational tool to teach students how to effectively and ethically use supporting information from other sources. The Turnitin.com software allows students and faculty to check papers for originality. Using the reports, students can determine what sections of a paper or assignment may need revision because they fail to document sources and/or fail to indicate when sources are properly placed in quotation marks among other common mistakes. Although the trial for Turnitin.com will use a separate Web-based submission process, the software can also be fully integrated into Blackboard's digital dropbox feature.

The purpose of the trial study is to determine whether or not Turnitin.com can be used efficiently by teachers and students and whether the software can enhance the educational experience for students. Although other universities use the software strictly as a tool for detecting plagiarism, our intent is to develop protocols for using the software that will allow it to serve more of an educational function. To that end, we ask that those who wish to participate in the trial do the following:

1. If you use Turnitin.com for an assignment, you should provide students with the opportunity and/or require students to analyze drafts of their papers using the software. To meet our objective of using Turnitin.com in a pedagogically sound way, students should be allowed to obtain and respond to originality reports on their work prior to final submission.
2. You should encourage students to meet with you or someone from the Center for Writing Excellence to review at least one originality report from a draft. Such meetings will provide you with an opportunity to talk with students about your expectations for originality. Our intent is that Turnitin.com will spark dialogue and learning about effective writing habits rather than just be a tool for "detecting plagiarism."
3. Originality reports on final drafts should not be the sole determinant of whether a student committed academic misconduct. The originality report metric that tells you how much of the paper is "similar" to other sources should be carefully evaluated. We recommend that you carefully evaluate how the student used sources in the assignment to determine if the similarity was caused by a lack of proper citation or actual copying of another source. Final grading decisions should be appropriate to the offense.
4. We would like to discuss the effectiveness of the software as a group. For that discussion we would like to know the average "similarity rating" that you observed for each assignment. We would also like to have you present any cases that you observed where academic misconduct and/or gross citation errors occurred.
5. We will create a survey about the use of Turnitin.com that should be completed by you and your students. We ask that you administer this survey so that we can integrate the data into our final report on the software as an option for the university.

To use the software, faculty should take care to inform students about steps they should take to protect their privacy and should also give students the opportunity to “opt out” of using the software. As such, faculty should include the following statement on their syllabus if they plan to use the software:

Ohio University has purchased a license to use Turnitin.com, a Web-based software tool to help students and teachers analyze, evaluate, and provide feedback on written papers and assignments. The software will be used in this class to analyze both drafts and final versions of papers. Drafts are considered “harmless” in the sense that you will have the opportunity to revise your paper to correct mistakes. All versions of papers should be the original work of the student; the software may be used to evaluate the originality of the work.

Documents submitted to Turnitin.com will become part of a database used for comparison with other papers submitted for analysis. Thus, having your paper in the database will protect you from having others inappropriately use your scholarly work. ***To protect your privacy, you should delete your name, e-mail, identification number, or any other personally identifying information from the assignment before submitting it to Turnitin.com.***

If you want to opt out of using this software tool, you must inform the instructor, in writing, before the end of week 2 or two days before the first written draft or assignment is due, whichever comes first. If you opt to not use the software, you must turn in a comprehensive portfolio for each draft/final paper containing brainstorming notes, iterations of the paper as you revise it, copies of all sources cited in the paper, and annotations explaining what material out of the sources was used. If you opt out of using the program, other electronic tools may be used to analyze your work.

In addition, the following language should be placed on the assignment sheet.

To evaluate this assignment I will use Turnitin.com to help check for proper use of sources. You may submit a draft to Turnitin.com for analysis prior to submitting a final version of the assignment. I am available to go over your originality report with you to help identify ways to improve your draft before final submission. Your final assignment must be submitted to Turnitin.com prior to the due date. You should remove any personally identifiable information (name, e-mail, identification number, etc.) from the document that you submit. Also, if you opt out of using this tool you must submit a hard copy, electronic copy, and portfolio by the due date (see the syllabus for details).

The trial for Turnitin.com is being conducted by the Center for Academic Technology for the Academic Honesty Committee (contact co-chair Scott Titsworth, titswort@ohio.edu).

Appendix D:
Working Draft Of Honor Code

Ohio University Honor Code **Working Draft**

Ohio University values integrity. Students, faculty, administrators, and staff have a shared responsibility to embrace the pursuit of learning and to foster a commitment to academic integrity. All members of the campus community also share an obligation to challenge obstacles to that pursuit and redress violations of that commitment.

Academic integrity is the foundation of all activities that promote learning, including critical and imaginative thinking, discovery of knowledge, and expressions of creativity. Academic integrity also entails refraining from plagiarism, cheating, and other unethical acts that undermine the values of the campus community.

The [University Judiciaries Statement on Academic Misconduct](#), [Student Code of Conduct](#), and [Faculty Handbook](#) identify unique expectations for individuals who fulfill different roles at the university.

Appendix E:
Draft of Recommendations from Student Judiciaries

Proposed Revisions to Judicial Process: Addressing Academic Integrity Issues

University Judiciaries
October 18, 2006
Draft

The following describe possible changes to the judicial process for the purpose of better handling issues of academic integrity at Ohio University. This is an important issue for all institutions of higher education. We must maintain an atmosphere of high academic standards and foster an ethos of integrity within our university if we are to be most successful. Proposed changes include:

- **Add Academic Integrity Hearing Boards.** Adding Academic Integrity Hearing Boards (AIHB) to the current structure of University Judiciaries would strengthen it. This model would incorporate majority representation from the college in which the allegation of academic misconduct originates. One possible board composition would be one faculty member and two students from the college of origination along with one faculty/administrator and one student from the University Hearing Board pool not from the college of origin. This composition would allow the college to exert its expertise in specific academic expectations.
- **Create centralized repository of faculty classroom action.** University Judiciaries would serve as a centralized repository for all instances of academic misconduct. This would include both those cases brought forward for adjudication as well as those handled directly in the classroom by faculty members. This would allow the university to track habitual violators and keep better data on the infractions at hand. During a meeting of the AIHB, classroom action taken by faculty would be utilized as previous record during the sanctioning phase, if necessary.
- **Create on-line submission process.** University Judiciaries would provide faculty members with two separate on-line forms for reporting instances of academic misconduct. One form would be for formal judicial actions while the second would serve as a submission to the centralized repository. The latter form would also be utilized as a notification for students that the information may be used in the judicial process if future cases arise. There also needs to be clear directions for students in understanding the grade appeal process.
- **Improve support to faculty on how to foster academic integrity.** There needs to be consistent communication and education for faculty members regarding the new process. This will better enable us to foster an atmosphere of trust and an understanding of utility.
(Partner with CTE)

- **Improve orientation and education of students on academic integrity.** Students would also need to be educated. Ohio University needs to provide students with a solid understanding of academic integrity issues. If students have a better understanding of what is expected of them, they have a better chance of succeeding. Printing the policy on the syllabi is not enough, and we cannot expect every faculty member to cover this in all classes; there needs to be a centralized process for disseminating this information. Perhaps an online course/tutorial could be developed by all stakeholders. The education also needs to be integrated into the on-going orientation process for incoming students; additionally it could be used by individual faculty members as an assignment. (*Partner with the Academic Advancement Center and Precollege*)
- **Establish college liaisons.** Each college should designate a liaison to University Judiciaries. This person would serve as a first contact for faculty questions and to serve as a resource to facilitate effective use of the judicial process. The liaison would also provide a vehicle to communicate pertinent information to the colleges quickly.
- **Update information system supporting judicial process.** There needs to be university commitment including resources for the revisions to the Judicial process to be successful. Most notably, University Judiciaries must have an excellent information system to streamline the process. This would better enable the office to supply statistical data, to facilitate the flow of information to the university community, as well as to allow for further adaptation when necessary.

These changes should be reviewed and commented upon by the Review & Standards Committee. This committee has widespread membership serving the three major campus constituencies (students, faculty, and administration). The Review & Standards Committee is charged with the responsibility of reviewing and recommending changes to the Ohio University Code of Conduct.

**Ohio University
University Judiciaries
Academic Misconduct Report**

Submission of this document to University Judiciaries does not constitute a formal complaint against the student. A copy of this Academic Misconduct Report should be retained for your records. University Judiciaries will also retain a copy in the student file. These records may be utilized as previous record in the sanctioning phase of a hearing if subsequent referrals are filed. If you wish to file a formal complaint to initiate the disciplinary procedure, you may do so by completing the University Judiciaries Case Referral Form.

Faculty Name:
Address:
Date of Report:

Title:
Phone:

Student Reported:

PID:

Type of Academic Misconduct: (Drop down menu would be placed here including but not limited to the following options: plagiarism; cheating; un-permitted collaboration; forged attendance; fabrication; knowingly allowing another student to plagiarize or cheat from one's work; submitting the same assignment in different courses without consent of the instructor)

Day, Date, and Time of Alleged Offense:

Location:

Summary (Please be specific and present only factual information):

Action Taken by Faculty Member

(Drop down menu would be placed here including but not limited to the following options: failing grade on assignment; failing grade in class; lowered graded on assignment; lowered grade in class)

Explanation of Grade Appeal Process

By submitting this report, the faculty member acknowledges that the facts described herein are true to the best of his/her knowledge and belief.

Copy to Student Reported