

Academic Integrity Task Force
April 2, 2010
Minutes

1. Introductions

Present: Steve Hagen, Jen Day Shaw (recorder), Paige Crandall, Ken Gerhardt, Stephanie Hanson, Angela Lindner (via telephone), Chris Loschiavo, Sara Mock, Heidi Radunovich, Paul Robinson and Paul Sindelar

Focus: Creating a Culture of Integrity.

2. Is there a problem?

a. Evidence Nationally

1. Review of Research – Angela Lindner

Angela Lindner presented a PowerPoint presentation noting the following survey statistics from charactercounts.org and other resources:

1997 Results

80% of undergraduates cheated at least once.

2007 Results

Cheating among majors within the last year

- 1 Business – 91%
- 2 Engineering – 82%
- 3 Social Sciences - 73%
- 4 Natural Sciences - 71%

2008 Survey

Of 30,000 high school students surveyed:

64% cheated within the year.

38% cheated 2 or more times.

There was no difference in gender.

47% were from non-religious schools.

63% were from religious schools.

SE –70% cheated.

West - 64% cheated

NE - 63% cheated

36% - Internet plagiarism

26% - Lied on survey

93% - Satisfied with own character

77% - Believed they are more ethical than others

Business /Engineering cheated the most, consistently.

Josephson Institute – chart

Engineering students from 11 institutions were asked, “If the student thought specific behavior was cheating:”

- 96% considered copying from another as cheating.
- Implication is that student perception of cheating may differ from student to student.
- Faculty need to be more explicit.

2. Group Input from Review of Chronicle and Stanford Articles

Articles shared: looked at topically

- Define
- Collect data
- Recommendations

Thoughts: Falsifying data in thesis and dissertations, during the process or after graduate education an issue--- funded research.

Conflict for faculty advisor on thesis/dissertation.

All different:

- Graduate level, undergraduate, distance learning, professional school, international students
- Homework, papers, exams

Before the next meeting, Jen/Stephanie will construct a bibliography of articles (will evolve) that can contribute to the following

- Definitions
- Tools
- Recommendations

Members are to send information to Stephanie.

b. Evidence at UF

1. Summary of Dr. Radunovich et al. article – Heidi Radunovich

Heidi et al. did a study at UF with College of Agricultural and Life Sciences students.

25% of 160 plagiarized in her class; used TurnItIn.com

- Lack of understanding plagiarism; lead to survey of what student know through scenario use
- Discovered variability in student knowledge of plagiarism
- Can't make assumptions of what the students understand.
- Repeated training is necessary.

- Heidi suggests that students need to be exposed to the topic at least annually through education.
- Some students didn't have writing skills even though they were juniors/seniors.
- Some students panic and take shortcuts.
- Some demonstrate unethical behavior
- Having the same foundational education is important.
- Technology is an issue given it is so easy and available now.
- Survey – We need to find out what the student/faculty knows---can't just use "plagiarism."

2. Current Definitions – Paige Crandall

Paige handed out the Honor Code. The Honor Code and Conduct Code have been overhauled recently. Paige walked the committee through the Honor Code.

- Intent is not necessary.
- Sanctions are typically more severe if intent is there.
- Recommended change to regulations: Add *possession* to current regulation; current regulation only states use of cheat sheet is a violation – raised by two current cases where student has cheat sheet but not clear if used.
- Technology is a huge issue.
- Dean of Students office has seen all charges except bribery. The most common are plagiarism, cheating and prohibited collaboration.
- Committee should read through carefully as this is current policy.

3. Review of SERU Data – Paige Crandall

SERU, every 2 years, Spring 2009 - university-wide/ college/ major breakdown

- High response rate
- 73% of 20,000 undergraduates , although response varies by question
- On the Institutional Research website
- Executive summary very helpful

4. Review of DSO Data – Chris Loschiavo

Chris presented data of violations from current and past years.

Comments:

- Community-wide effort is most effective.
- Why students cheat:
 - Pressure to perform
 - No intent; lack of understanding

- Time management skills, careless or rushed
- Faculty behavior
 - Set tone to take academic integrity seriously
 - Clear expectations
 - Same use of exam every year not helpful.

Comment: Responsible conduct of research: ongoing now as a focus.

3. Surveying UF Constituents

a. Survey availability – Chris Loschiavo

Watch for too much length. May consider subsets for different groups, i.e., international students, graduate students.

4. Next steps – other data needed; what to cover in a survey

i. Actions:

1. Task Force members were asked to review the data provided by DSO and to determine if other data would be helpful to gather. We will discuss these ideas next meeting although task force members were encouraged to e-mail Chris (copied to chair) to see if the data are doable.
 2. All members were asked to bring their ideas regarding issues to cover in a survey of the UF community (faculty/staff and students) to the next meeting.
 3. Members were encouraged to e-mail relevant references to Stephanie to be able to create a reference list. Jen, Angela, and Stephanie will work on this list.
- ii. We will review survey information next meeting; we will also need to consider barriers and incentives to assessing and facilitating behavior related to academic integrity.

Next Meeting: April 16th 2:00-3:30 pm in 4170 HPNP Building