

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY TASK FORCE REPORT

www.aa.ufl.edu/task_force/academic_integrity/

BACKGROUND

On March 18, 2010 Provost Joseph Glover and Senate Chair Dr. Jack Mecholsky charged the Academic Integrity Task Force (AITF) with determining whether there is a problem with academic integrity at UF and, if so, to determine how widespread the problem is, characterize the associated issues, and make recommendations for change. This report, submitted 11/22/11, summarizes the activities and findings of the AITF in an attempt to fulfill its charge.

Task Force Representation

Final Task Force Membership*			
Task Force Representative	Title	Primary Affiliation	Role
Stephanie Hanson	Executive Associate Dean; Clinical Professor	Public Health and Health Professions	Chair
Jen Day Shaw	Associate VP of Student Affairs; Dean of Students	Dean of Students Office	Co-chair
Kenneth Gerhardt	Senior Associate Dean, Graduate School; Professor	Graduate School	Member
Angela Lindner	Associate Dean for Student Affairs; Associate Professor	Engineering	Member
Chris Loschiavo	Assistant Dean; Director Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution	Dean of Students Office	Member
Bernard Mair	Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs	Provost's Office	Member (Provost's Liaison)
Sara Mock	Assistant Director	Liberal Arts and Sciences Academic Advising	Member (representing professional advisors)
Paul Robinson	Graduate Student	Engineering	Member (representing students)
Heidi Radunovich	Assistant Professor	Agricultural and Life Sciences	Member
Paul Sindelar	Professor	Education	Member
Stephen Hagen	Professor	Liberal Arts and Sciences (Physics)	Member (served through Dec. 2010, on sabbatical Spring 2011, rejoined Fall 2012)
Other Participants			
Bibiana (Telka) Jackson	Professional Student	Dentistry	Served as member until Sept. 2010,

			resigned given scheduling conflicts
Teresa Kauf	Associate Professor	Pharmacy	Served as member initially but unable to attend meetings; provided background assistance in 2010
Paige Crandall	Interim Dean of Students	Dean of Students Office	Member until left UF in May 2010; replaced by Dr. Shaw

*Moses Divaker was appointed to the Task Force as a student representative but did not serve

Additional Critical Support			
Marie Zeglen	Assistant Provost and Director	Office of Institutional Planning and Research	Consultant - Survey Design and Resource Support
Noelle Mecoli	Senior Statistical Analyst	Office of Institutional Planning and Research	Consultant - Survey Design and Data Analysis Support
Kim Kitagawa Pace	Assistant Provost	Provost's Office	Web site management; posting minutes

Primary Task Force Activities Undertaken and Survey Demographics

1. *Review of Main Components of UF Honor Code* – This activity oriented the Task Force members to the definitions related to UF academic integrity and provided the opportunity to discuss these to ensure everyone shared the same basic frame of reference as the Task Force proceeded (April 2010).
2. *2009 Dean of Students Office (DSO) Data and Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) Survey Results Review* - DSO data were acquired to determine the number of reported Honor Code violations. SERU is a multi-university undergraduate survey that includes a section on questions of special interest to each university. These data were used to determine whether there were concerns regarding academic integrity on campus (April-May 2010).
3. *Comprehensive Literature Review* – This activity was used to ground potential issues not identified by the data listed in #2 above and to identify categories suggested in the literature that the Task Force should address as part of its survey activities (see below). Topical areas included: definitions of academic dishonesty; faculty and student attitudes toward integrity, misconduct, and motivation to cheat or not to cheat; institutional culture and support; how students cheat; and prevention, interventions, and sanctions (April-May 2010). A bibliography is provided in Appendix 4 at the end of this document.
4. *Establishment of Discussion Board for Campus Input* – Tested in April and early May; established for general use in May 2010; our intention was to use the board as a communication tool and to provide one mechanism to gain input and ideas from UF stakeholders. The board proved somewhat cumbersome and was used minimally.
5. *Review of Academic Honesty Language in the Undergraduate Catalog* (requested by Associate Provost Bernard Mair) – Recommendations for changes to the descriptive

language (not the Honor Code itself) were made to clarify student, faculty, and administrator responsibilities in facilitating academic integrity at UF.

6. *Meetings with Specific Invested Stakeholders*, including UF Distance Learning Coordinators and STEM researchers – The purpose of the meeting with the distance learning coordinators was to determine current strategies used to prevent academic misconduct; we viewed the STEM researchers' academic integrity tool to ensure our tools were complementary rather than redundant.
7. *Meeting with Dr. Donald McCabe* – We participated in a special meeting with Don McCabe, Professor of Management and Global Business at Rutgers University, a nationally recognized expert in academic integrity and misconduct, to solicit feedback on drafted survey questions and to discuss the overall focus of our work.
8. *Faculty Survey Design and Implementation* – This on-line survey was the primary tool for gathering information regarding faculty perceptions of UF academic integrity issues. The survey opened on January 18, 2011 and closed on February 6, 2011.

The percent of faculty participating was 28%, with 958 faculty volunteering to take the survey. Faculty represented different types of appointments with 13.5% on the tenure track, 55.9% tenured, and 24.4% non-tenure track (6% chose not to identify their appointment type). Every college was represented, with the largest percentage of faculty, 30.2%, teaching in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 29.2% in the Health Science Center, 14.2% in Agricultural and Life Sciences, and 7.7% in Engineering. The participation by faculty in the remaining colleges was less than 7% each.

Of those responding, 34% of the faculty were women, 52.3% were men, and 13.8% preferred not to identify their gender. The majority of respondents were white (75.4%) with a significant remainder (18.5%) not identifying their race. Therefore, we do not know the distribution by race other than the 3.2% who identified their race as Asian, 1.6% as mixed race, 0.3% African American, and 0.1% American Indian, Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Seventy-seven percent indicated they were not of Hispanic origin but 20.2% preferred not to identify their ethnicity. Most faculty (74%) reported being U.S. citizens, while 8.8% were naturalized citizens, 4.4% were on permanent resident visas, and a few were on a temporary visa (1.5%); 11.6% preferred not to answer the citizenship question.

9. *Student Survey Design and Implementation* – This on-line survey was the primary tool for gathering information regarding student perceptions of UF academic integrity issues. The survey opened on February 21, 2011 and closed on March 7, 2011.

Of the approximately 50,000 students at the University of Florida, 6,098 students volunteered to participate in the survey. The majority of respondents were seniors (18%) followed closely by master's students (17.3%) and juniors (17%). The majority was female (61%) and White (72%). It is notable that the number of minority students completing the survey was lower than expected considering their levels of representation at the university. However, this might be partly accounted for by the number who indicated that they preferred not to answer (7.1%), identified as mixed race (4.1%) or identified as "other" (3.2%). The majority were U.S. Citizens (84.1%). Most were CLAS students, (25%), followed by Engineering (13.4%) and Business Administration (10.5%).

10. *Faculty and Student Focus Groups*

- a. Faculty focus groups held in January 2011 – 3 small focus groups were held that helped provide greater detail on faculty views of academic integrity.

- b. Student focus groups – Our intention was to launch these after both the AITF student survey and SERU data were collected. SERU data were not available until October 2011 so focus groups were not implemented.
11. *Addition of Academic Integrity Questions to the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) Survey* - We were granted the opportunity to add four multi-part questions to this special interest section. This survey was launched in March, and the number of students answering these questions ranged from 5,809 to 5,859.
12. *Review and Interpretation of Survey Data* - Two AITF subgroups were formed to review faculty and student survey data, respectively.
13. *Creation of the “Faculty Suggestions for Supporting Academic Integrity in the Classroom” guide* – This guide represents a detailed summary of faculty suggestions for creating and maintaining academic integrity in the classroom and for managing academic misconduct. This guide was compiled from the faculty comments provided in the survey and focus groups. We have appended the *Faculty Suggestions for Supporting Academic Integrity* to this report for general use. (Please see Appendix 3.)

MAJOR FINDINGS

IS THERE AN ISSUE WITH ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT UF?

The results of the literature review suggested significant concerns about academic misconduct among high school seniors who are college-bound and among college students. For example, the Josephson Institute 2010 Report Card on Ethics of American Youth revealed that 58.8% of college-bound students report cheating on a test, and 80.7% report copying someone else’s homework. Survey data at higher institutions also indicate widespread cheating. McCabe has studied academic misconduct across decades and has reported high cheating rates across multiple majors (see, for example, McCabe 1997; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield 2001; and McCabe, 2005). In the 1997 study, total cheating by major was as follows: Business 76%, Engineering 68%, Natural Sciences 57%, and Social Sciences 61%. Summary results from McCabe’s 2001 and 2005 studies are presented in Appendix 1.

The 2009 SERU survey included a handful of questions that suggested academic misconduct required further exploration at UF as well. Approximately 36% of students believed academic cheating was a problem. There also seemed to be significant variation regarding student’s understanding of appropriate behavior. For example, 38% said using solution sets or sample papers from previous terms is acceptable but only 7.8% thought copying material from the Internet into an assignment without attribution is acceptable. In addition, Professor Heidi Radunovich in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences has conducted research suggesting students’ understanding of academic integrity is variable (Radunovich, Baugh, & Turner 2009). Finally, in 2009-2010, 96.7% of students suspected of Honor Code violations who were reported to the DSO were found responsible. However, the total number of violations reported to the DSO was quite small (average of 286 per year over the prior 3 years). From these data, the Task Force concluded that further exploration of academic integrity at UF was warranted, which led to the collection of survey data. In the remainder of the report, we primarily discuss the survey findings.

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THERE AN ISSUE?

Do faculty and students know what academic dishonesty is?

The majority of faculty and students believe they understand what academic dishonesty is. However, students vary on reports of the seriousness of misconduct depending upon the type of behavior in question.

On the Academic Integrity Task Force (AITF) survey, 77% of faculty indicated that they clearly understood what academic dishonesty is with 11.4% neutral and 11.4% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. As shown in the table below, tenure track faculty were just as likely as tenured faculty to agree or strongly agree that they understood academic integrity (79.2% vs. 78.8%).

Clearly understand what academic dishonesty is					
Faculty Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Non-tenure n=183	1.6%	8.7%	15.8%	60.7%	13.1%
Tenure Track n=101	1.0%	8.9%	10.9%	60.4%	18.8%
Tenured n=419	1.0%	11.0%	9.3%	59.9%	18.9%

Student reports of understanding academic misconduct at UF are somewhat mixed. On the 2011 SERU survey, 74% of students indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that they understood what academic cheating is and 75% indicated they understood what constitutes plagiarism at UF. On the AITF survey, students reported being fairly clear regarding what constitutes academic misconduct in relation to exams and quizzes (88% agree or strongly agree that they know what this entails) as well as papers and reports (83.4% agree or strongly agree that they know what this entails). However, the numbers who expressed agreement or strong agreement on what constitutes academic misconduct declined in other contexts such as homework (66.9%), using information from the Internet (60.9%), and lab (57.2%) and clinical (40.3%) work.

We also inquired about students' perceptions of the seriousness of different types of academic misconduct. As expected, the vast majority of students recognized many academic integrity issues as being either moderate or serious displays of misconduct, including issues such as copying, using others' work, or having someone else complete an assignment. However, there were some surprising results in student perceptions of the seriousness of some specific academic misconduct activities, particularly those related to receiving assistance from others. Below we report how students viewed misconduct.

"Trivial misconduct" includes:

- working together electronically or in person
- getting unauthorized help from someone who completed the assignment/paper previously

"Serious misconduct" includes:

- copying another student's computer program rather than writing one's own
- exaggerating clinical data or reports
- incorporating another student's research data as one's own
- incorporating another student's lab data as one's own
- copying and pasting text without citation
- quoting another author without citation
- copying and pasting from various sources and combining them
- using a free paper from the internet and submitting it as one's own

“Moderate misconduct” includes:

- adding, changing or deleting words in a quotation
- turning the same paper in for another class
- using unpermitted exams from a previous semester to prepare for an upcoming test

The majority of students (62.2%) reported that having friends or relatives edit their work is not academic misconduct with another 22.4% believing this to be only trivial misconduct. Nearly 64% (63.7%) of students indicated that working together when a professor requested individual work was either trivial misconduct or not academic misconduct, and getting unauthorized help from someone who completed the assignment or paper in a previous class was viewed as not misconduct or trivial misconduct by many (60.5%). These results may reflect the wide range of possible levels of assistance from proofreading to major assistance in creating the work. Although approximately one-half (51.3%) of the student respondents said that submitting the same paper for more than one class was moderate to serious misconduct, a surprising finding was that 23.6% reported submitting the same paper was trivial misconduct and another 25.1% reported this was not misconduct at all. These findings suggest a large minority of students do not understand plagiarism to the extent they think they do. Similarly, a sizeable percentage (38.1%) believed that altering words in a quotation is either not misconduct or consider it trivial misconduct, and 36.4% of students thought using unpermitted exams to study was either trivial (24.0%) or no misconduct at all (12.4%). Overall, students would likely benefit from receiving a clear message regarding the appropriateness of the use of help or materials from others, turning in papers that were previously submitted in another class, and the alteration of quotations.

These findings suggest that there is a need to provide students with education regarding specific components of academic misconduct. Students and faculty might also benefit from a review of the UF Student Honor Code. Approximately one-half in both groups felt they knew the Code well or very well with the remainder knowing it only somewhat or not at all.

What do faculty and students believe or perceive to be the extent of the problem?

Almost one-half of the faculty respondents believes academic dishonesty is a significant problem at UF, but the majority of faculty believes they are addressing the problem well. Students, on the other hand, take a more positive view, with only one-fifth believing academic misconduct is a significant problem at UF.

Although a significant percent of faculty believes that academic dishonesty is a problem at UF (46.5%), almost 70% reported they do a good job deterring academic dishonesty with most of the remaining faculty being neutral (25%). When faculty were given a list of items from which to choose, the **most commonly perceived behaviors of academic misconduct in the classroom in the past three years** from highest to lowest endorsement were:

1. copying from the Internet without attribution (67% believed this occurred at least a few times),
2. colluding on an individual assignment (61.2%),
3. copying homework (57.1%),
4. copying from a book or journal without attribution (56.1%), and
5. turning in a fake excuse for a missed exam or assignment (52.6%).

The least commonly perceived offenses were:

1. falsifying research data (90.8% believed this never or only rarely occurs),
2. using an aid to cheat during an exam or quiz (85.8% never or rarely),
3. using unauthorized cheat sheets during an exam or quiz, (84.7% never or rarely),
4. copying a term paper or project (78.8% never or rarely) and
5. using unauthorized exams or other materials (74% never or rarely).

Overall, faculty believed that a much larger proportion of undergraduates than either graduate or professional students were academically dishonest in at least one of their courses in the past year.

Regardless of whether you witnessed academic dishonesty, what percent of students do you think have been academically dishonest in at least one of your courses this past year?

Student Type	% of Students Faculty Rated as Dishonest					
	<10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-50%	51-75%	> 75%
Undergraduate n=496	54.0%	25.0	11.5	5.9	2.0	1.6
Graduate N=515	79.4%	11.7%	5.4%	1.9	1.4	0
Professional N=245	79.2	12.2	5.3	1.6	1.6	0

Fewer students than faculty believe that academic misconduct is a significant problem. On the SERU survey, 74% of students somewhat to strongly disagreed that academic dishonesty is a significant problem whereas 26% of students somewhat to strongly agreed that academic dishonesty is an issue. Approximately one-fifth of students (20.6%) on the AITF survey reported that academic misconduct is a significant problem at UF (see percentage by college in Appendix 2), while 46% did not believe academic misconduct is an issue (with the remainder being neutral).

However, approximately 22.7% agreed or strongly agreed that it would be easy to cheat at UF if they wanted to do so. The SERU survey produced similar results – 24% somewhat to strongly agreed that it would be easy to cheat. That said, the overwhelming majority of students (85.3%) felt that no one at UF had used their academic products to cheat or plagiarize, and the majority of students did not believe it would be easy to cheat.

Students' perceptions of dishonesty varied somewhat depending upon the activity about which we inquired. On the AITF survey, students were asked how frequently they thought specific academic violations occurred in the past year in their courses. The results are summarized below based on removing those students who marked the question "not applicable to my courses".

The majority of students felt that this occurred a few times or frequently:

1. Working together when the instructor asked for individual work

The majority of students felt that these never or rarely occurred:

1. Using unauthorized cheat sheets or notes
2. Using unauthorized electronic aids during exams
3. Using unauthorized exams or material to prepare for an exam, or to complete assignments
4. Learning what's on an exam from someone who already took it
5. Using unauthorized materials to complete assignments/papers
6. Turning in a fake excuse for missed exams or assignments
7. Someone copying from another student on an exam or quiz

Although the majority of students has a positive view of the academic culture at UF, there were several areas of concern about specific behaviors. The most obvious area is working together when not authorized to do so. Nearly sixty percent of respondents believe students were working together a few times or frequently when the instructor asked for individual work

whereas only 17.4% believed this never occurred. This perception of a high level of unauthorized collaboration is interesting in light of the fact that most students said that they had “never” been asked by another student to help him/her plagiarize or cheat. This seems consistent with the finding reported previously that suggests students believe this type of behavior is trivial misconduct.

Although several items did not garner majority percentages, the overall percent of students believing specific behaviors were occurring is still a concern. These behaviors include the following.

- Learning about exam content from those who had taken an earlier version of the exam (46.2% believed this happened a few times or frequently; only 30.8% believed this never happened)
- Turning in fake excuses for missed exams or assignments (36.4% believed this happened a few times or frequently; 38.3% believed this never happened)
- Copying from other students on exams or quizzes (36.1% believed this happened a few times or frequently; 37.2% believed this never happened)
- Using unauthorized materials to prepare for an exam (33.8% believed this happened a few times or frequently; 43.7% believed this never happened)

It is noteworthy that students reported that they believe they know the Honor Code at UF “somewhat” (35.6%), “very well” (17.7%) or somewhere in between (35.5%), suggesting that further education regarding the Honor Code may be useful.

But how do the perceptions of the faculty and students compare with direct evidence of academic misconduct? This will be reviewed next.

To what extent have faculty witnessed or students been directly involved in academic misconduct?

Consistent with faculty perceptions of misconduct, faculty have direct evidence of more academic misconduct among undergraduates although they have observed some misconduct at the graduate and professional level as well. Although most students deny even unintentional academic misconduct, a significant minority of students have either been asked by other students to engage in academic misconduct or have directly witnessed academic misconduct.

Adjudication Data: There has been a 75% increase in the average number of cases reported to the Dean of Students Office in the past three years (from average of 286 to 497), with almost 600 violations reported in 2010. However, during this same time the DSO changed their recording process for violations and launched an aggressive outreach campaign with colleges to improve relations and to increase knowledge and confidence in the adjudication process. Therefore, the DSO believes the increase is more reflective of better data capturing and faculty’s willingness to report incidents. Based on limited data from other institutions, UF data do not stand out. For example, this past year, UF violations were somewhat higher than UCF and University of Texas-Austin but lower than the Ohio State University.

Survey Results - Faculty Observations of Student Behavior: In general, faculty observed incidents of academic dishonesty far more often in undergraduate courses than in either graduate or professional courses. Almost 70% of faculty stated they had witnessed at least one incident of academic dishonesty in their on-campus undergraduate courses in the past three years, compared to 34.7% for graduate courses and 23.8% for professional courses. Within these totals, over 23% (23.6%) of faculty directly witnessed or determined that academic misconduct had occurred a few or more times per year in their on-campus undergraduate courses. This compares to 4.9% for graduate students and 2.5% for professional students.

For courses taught primarily through distance learning, 36.2 % of faculty reported at least one incident, including 15.8% reporting a few or more incidents per year among undergraduates. Incidents among graduate students were approximately the same as on-campus courses with 33.8% of faculty reporting one or two incidents per year or less and 4.7% directly observing a few incidents. Professional students were again the lowest at 16.8% for at least one incident and 6.3% observing a few or more incidents per year.

Survey Results - Student Reports of Engagement in Academic Misconduct: Overall, the majority of students at UF do not report either engaging in or witnessing academic dishonesty. That said, on the SERU survey, 38% of students agreed somewhat or agreed strongly with the statement that they had directly observed someone cheating on exams, quizzes, or homework. The percentage of freshmen was 30%, sophomores 40%, juniors 35%, and seniors 40%. On the AITF survey, the vast majority of students reported that, to their knowledge, no one at UF has used their academic products to cheat or plagiarize (85.3%). However, nearly 30% of students reported being approached by another UF student who requested help in cheating or plagiarizing, and a smaller percentage of students (14.1%) admitted that they had inadvertently engaged in academic dishonesty only to realize it later.

Overall, these results suggest that the majority of students intend to avoid misconduct. That said, there is evidence from faculty and student reports that suggest a number of students have engaged in academic misconduct, either purposely or accidentally, and a number of students report that others have tried to induce them to engage in academic misconduct. Potential reasons may include that students have received little previous training in these issues, and their expectations regarding what constitutes misconduct may differ from instructors or vary across instructors, disciplines, or cultures. Therefore, combining institutional education regarding academic integrity with discipline-specific training and direct communication by instructors regarding what is considered appropriate for their courses will be important.

CHARACTERIZING THE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND MISCONDUCT

Current Behavior and Accountability

Faculty were asked to indicate how many incidents of academic dishonesty they reported to the Dean of Students Office. This question provides two different types of data. First, approximately 33% of faculty working with undergraduates, 30% with graduate students, and 62% with professional students marked this question as not applicable. This would suggest that approximately 2/3 of faculty working with undergraduates or graduate students and 1/3 working with professional students were involved in responding to at least one incident of academic misconduct. Second, a large percentage of faculty did not report the incident(s) – 46.2% for undergraduates, 58.4% for graduates, and 33% for professional students. This perception is further reinforced if one recalls the fact that almost 70% of faculty stated they had witnessed at least one incident of academic dishonesty in their on-campus undergraduate courses in the past three years. But why would faculty fail to report a significant percentage of instances of academic misconduct? There are clues to this behavior from multiple responses.

Faculty believe they (a) have the skills to adequately manage academic dishonesty (68.6% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement) and (b) do a good job deterring academic dishonesty in their classes (69.8%), which students concur with (63.2% agreed or strongly agreed that instructors do a good job deterring academic misconduct). These findings suggest faculty might choose to independently manage situations that arise. In fact, 75% of faculty reported that they always talk with students involved in academic misconduct (5.7% reported never talking with the student). This does not preclude reporting; it simply suggests that faculty are taking active steps to resolve incidents. Additional evidence, however, indicated that approximately one-half of the faculty might be dissuaded from reporting if they wanted to resolve the incident themselves, as noted in the table below. It is likely this is situation-specific

Page 9 of 31

given that only about one-fifth of faculty reported that they believe they should be able to manage academic dishonesty without using university processes.

Faculty beliefs about the reporting process or its ramifications may influence faculty's decision on whether to contact the Dean of Students Office. Below is a summary of the percentages of faculty who indicated that information from or about a student would affect to a limited extent or definitely affect their decision to report an incident of misconduct. We report the top seven items the faculty endorsed.

Factors that might dissuade faculty from reporting (to a limited or greater extent)

Belief or Experience	% of faculty dissuaded from reporting
Desire to resolve without reporting the outcome	49.9%
Level of punishment would not match incident	43.1%
Process too long or cumbersome	40.8%
Lack of administrative support by department or college	40.1%
Experience self-doubt or second guessing what was observed	39.8%
Concern about possible litigation	39.1%
Lack of administrative support beyond college level	38.3%

Only one of the variables listed above is directly connected to student behavior – litigation. Although faculty were worried about possible litigation, the majority were not particularly worried about student retaliation via student evaluations of the course in making a decision to report an academic misconduct violation. However, there were several other types of student variables that influenced their decision not to report. In particular, if the student's behavior was viewed as unintentional, over 80% of faculty said that they probably would not or definitely would not report the incident. Additional variables are included in the table below.

Factors that would probably or definitely dissuade a faculty member from reporting

Belief or Experience	% of faculty dissuaded from reporting
Believe behavior was unintentional	81.8%
Student actively and positively engaged in class until incident occurred	42.1%
Student has active mental health issues	34.9%
Student is experiencing significant family stress	30.4%
High performing student "helping" lower performing student	27.2%

Interestingly, although faculty were somewhat influenced by the student's family circumstances, they were much less likely to consider the student's financial circumstances with only 17.6% saying significant stress in this area would matter. Faculty were generally not influenced much by the direct effect of the student's course grade on career plans or a previously undisclosed disability (81% reporting unlikely to affect decision).

Students were fairly consistent in their responses that cheating is unacceptable, even when there are extenuating circumstances. On the SERU, freshmen were just as likely as seniors to indicate that cheating was unacceptable (86% and 88%, respectively, stating it is not okay to cheat). On the AITF survey, students reported that none of the extenuating circumstances suggested would constitute an acceptable reason to cheat or plagiarize. Running out of time, professors treating the student unfairly, grades needed for a specific career path, university

events, difficult material, lack of meaningful material, and the instructor not taking academic misconduct seriously were all viewed as unacceptable reasons to cheat or plagiarize. A family emergency was the only situation endorsed by more than 10% (11%) of students responding to the survey.

Tools to encourage academic integrity and to deter academic misconduct

Students were surveyed regarding faculty actions that could help deter academic misconduct by students. Several strategies were rated by a majority of students as either moderately or very helpful as shown below.

- Using different exam forms or mixing exam questions (87.4%)
- Having strict consequences for academic misconduct (86.4%)
- Having proctored exams (84%)
- Instructors clearly communicating their expectations regarding academic honesty (83.8%)
- Using technology for plagiarism detection (72.2%)
- Receiving an explanation of what plagiarism and cheating are (64%)
- Not permitting students to leave the room during exams (60.1%)

Faculty were also surveyed regarding the importance of specific actions to upholding academic integrity. In general, faculty more strongly endorsed the overlapping items from the student list.

Faculty Action	% students rating moderately or very helpful	% faculty rating moderately or very important
Using different exam forms or mixing exam questions	87.4%	82.1%
Having strict consequences for academic misconduct	86.4%	96.3%
Having proctored exams	84.0%	88.1%
Instructors clearly communicating their expectations regarding academic honesty/intolerance for dishonesty	83.8%	81.9%
Using technology for plagiarism detection	72.2%	71.0%

Actions that a majority of students felt were mildly or not at all helpful include signing the UF Honor Code Pledge (71%), participating in a discussion of the importance of academic integrity (53.4%), and including a statement of academic honesty on course syllabi (59.8%). It is notable that the research literature contradicts student perceptions of the importance of these issues in deterring academic misconduct. Faculty were somewhat split on the importance of students signing the Honor Code pledge (54.5% moderately or very important, 31.9% mildly important, and 13.7% not at all important). It was the lowest rated action inquired about related to upholding integrity. A stronger majority believed a statement of academic honesty on the syllabus was important (71.6% moderately or very important).

Of the issues rated above as moderately or very helpful, we collected additional specific information on the survey on behavioral consequences, proctored exams, instructor communication, and use of technology. We will briefly report on these below.

Consequences for academic misconduct

Being held accountable for academic misconduct was one of the most highly endorsed items by both students and faculty. Most students (54.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that students who violate the Honor Code are held accountable by UF (see percentage by college in Appendix 2), with only 16.1% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing (the rest being neutral). Faculty were somewhat noncommittal on this question, with 34% believing UF enforces the Honor Code, 45.6% being neutral or expressing no opinion, and 20.4% disagreeing. However, the majority of faculty (78.6%) indicated they would encourage another faculty member who witnessed academic dishonesty to report the incident.

We also surveyed both faculty and students regarding what they believed the most reasonable sanction would be for first time and second time cheating violations. The most strongly endorsed item by both groups for a first offense was a grade penalty on the assignment or exam. For a second offense, the students and faculty both endorsed a failing grade in the course. The percentages are not quite directly comparable because students were given more choices. That said, the items are summarized below with an N/A used for items not on the faculty survey.

% of Respondents Endorsing Each Sanction for Cheating

Sanction for Cheating	First Offense		Second Offense	
	% Students Endorsing	% Faculty Endorsing	% Students Endorsing	% Faculty Endorsing
Verbal warning	12.8	6.5	0.6	N/A
Grade penalty on assignment	48.3	44.2	8.2	2.6
Lower overall grade in course but not failing	15.3	20.6	14.4	5.3
Failing grade in course	10.0	24.7	35.3	35.2
Receive an incomplete and repeat work	9.2	N/A	12.0	6.6
Withdraw from course	1.5	N/A	4.4	3.9
Dismissed from program, enter another UF major	0.2	N/A	4.3	1.3
Suspended or dismissed	2.0	2.4	20.1 (9.4 suspend; 10.7 dismiss)	44.5 (18.9 suspend; 25.6 dismiss)
None of the above	0.6	1.6	0.6	0.6

These data suggest it may be possible to create general guidelines for sanctions, recognizing that severity of actions and the context would still need to be taken into account. Furthermore, results from faculty focus groups indicated that having guidelines or suggestions for appropriate sanctions for academic violations would be helpful to faculty members as they go through the reporting process.

Proctored Exams

Students and faculty alike believe that proctored exams help deter academic misconduct. Fortunately, students (73.5%) reported that proctoring took place often or always during exams administered during the past year. Only 8.3% reported that their exams were not proctored with another 11% reporting seldom use of proctors. This is consistent with the results from the faculty, 74.9% of whom reported using proctors often or always. This still leaves some room for improvement given that 18.3% of the faculty stated they never use proctors. However, it is important to note that proctors may not be appropriate for some exam processes.

Instructor Communication

Overall, students agreed that instructor communication on both the consequences of academic misconduct and the components of academic misconduct are adequate. A large percentage of students (45.4%) felt that an instructor's communication of expectations regarding academic honesty is "very helpful."

For those students who had served as teaching assistants, the majority (69.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that they possessed the skills to appropriately manage academic misconduct, although 39.7% disagreed that they had received training from a course supervisor on how to do so.

Students agreed or strongly agreed that instructors clearly communicate:

- Their expectations for academic integrity (86.3% agreed or strongly agreed)
- Potential consequences of academic misconduct (73%)
- The appropriateness or inappropriateness of using:
 - a. Other students' work on assignments (80.6%)
 - b. Internet material on assignments or papers (72.7%)
 - c. Other students' work for exam preparation (59.9%)

The other side of communication is how faculty view their responsibility to communicate with students. Faculty (93.4%) generally believed they need to make every effort to minimize academic dishonesty, and 71% reported discussing academic integrity often or always with their students; 73.6% also endorsed the idea of an academic program policy on the value of integrity and intolerance of dishonesty.

However, faculty do not necessarily feel supported in their efforts. Only 35.5% thought faculty had the resources necessary to deter academic misconduct in on-campus courses, and only 9.6% believed faculty had the resources to deter misconduct in on-line courses. While faculty believed academic integrity is valued by faculty in their college (84.2%), less than one-half reported that either their college administration or the UF administration clearly communicated the importance of integrity to either faculty or students. Faculty clearly believe that institutional communication regarding integrity is important (86.1%).

Use of technology

The use of plagiarism detection software, such as Turnitin.com or other web-based plagiarism detection programs, was not in high use in courses, with only 24.7% of students reporting that Turnitin.com was required often or always, and only 26.1% of the faculty reporting using it often or always. Other web-based plagiarism systems were used even less, with only 5.7% of students and 4.9% of faculty reporting their use often or always. The majority of students reported "never" being asked to use Turnitin.com or any other plagiarism detection service. This is confirmed by faculty's report of lack of use, despite students' belief that such tools are a good deterrent. That said, of those faculty that require papers, nearly 70% reported they check them for plagiarism either with or without a web-based system. Faculty did indicate some interest in receiving a tutorial on plagiarism detection software (48.7% moderately or definitely interested).

They also expressed similar or stronger interest in tutorials on the latest cheating techniques, how to prevent misconduct and intervene with students suspected of misconduct, and international and cultural issues related to understanding integrity.

SUMMARY

The Task Force was charged with evaluating academic integrity issues at UF. In addition to developing the student and faculty surveys, the Task Force gathered information from the research literature on issues related to incidence, causes and associated factors, and prevention, interventions and sanctions for academic misconduct in higher education; three small faculty focus groups were held with participants representing various colleges; and the Task Force consulted with different campus constituents (i.e. distance learning coordinators, the STEM researchers), and Dr. Donald McCabe, an international expert in the field, who assisted with survey development. Finally, the Task Force placed specific questions related to academic integrity and misconduct on the UF-specific section of the SERU survey.

The overall results suggest that both students and faculty value academic integrity and hold beliefs and/or are involved in a number of activities that support a positive climate of integrity. That said, the results raise a number of issues that suggest that as a community we can improve our culture and activities at multiple levels of the university in stronger support of academic integrity. These activities include enhanced communication about the value of academic integrity by colleges and administration, better education of students regarding what academic integrity and misconduct are, reinforcing education of students and faculty regarding the Honor Code, broader use of tools that can deter misconduct, more consistent use of reporting processes and provision of guidelines for sanctions, evaluation of the resources faculty believe are necessary to assist them in protecting academic integrity, and provision of tutorials to help faculty maintain a positive academic environment in which academic misconduct is minimized.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of the Task Force recommendations is to infuse academic integrity throughout UF. These recommendations are aimed at (1) strengthening the culture of academic integrity as a fundamental component of the Gator Nation, (2) contributing to faculty and student knowledge and skills regarding academic integrity and associated processes, (3) facilitating positive connections among faculty, administrators, and students regarding academic integrity, and (4) maintaining a learning environment that supports and reinforces ethical behavior over time. The recommendations are divided into short-term goals (STGs) and long-term goals (LTGs) and are presented as a prioritized list within each section.

SHORT-TERM GOALS – Design and Implement within a Year

1. Create a university-wide standing committee on integrity to oversee implementation of these recommendations and subsequently serve as the oversight body for academic integrity initiatives on the campus. Committee members would liaison with points of contact across the colleges, student affairs, and the provost's office.
2. Designate a point person in each college to serve as the academic integrity resource. Responsibilities would include serving as a point of contact for faculty and staff regarding academic integrity issues, serving as a support person for faculty and staff who undergo

the adjudication process with students, and coordinating the systematic discussion of ethics within the relevant professions at College professional development events, meetings, etc. This individual would also oversee the establishment of a College-level committee that is composed of students, faculty, staff, and administrators. These individuals would initiate and implement academic integrity activities/processes in the college. As part of this process, we also recommend that one or more faculty be designated within each department to serve as a resource for individual programs.

3. Provide students with clear expectations on the syllabus and in the classroom regarding behaviors related to academic integrity (i.e. articulating clear do's and don'ts). The Task Force recommends the following specific actions to facilitate this process:
 - a. Create a checklist template that faculty members can attach to each assignment they provide. The faculty member would check relevant items for each assignment so that it is quite clear to the student what the instructor considers academic misconduct and what is considered allowable (e.g. studying from old exams, working together on an assignment, etc.).
 - b. Create syllabus statement templates stating what is allowable and what is considered cheating in the course. These statements could then be easily inserted or attached to syllabi as appropriate.
4. Develop informational guidelines/training for faculty regarding the Honor Code. This would include a tutorial and/or informational guide or face-to-face training covering the Honor Code with emphasis on the adjudication process. Material covered should include how the system works, how to use the reporting process, how to proceed with faculty-student conferences, and why reporting is important. (To be integrated into LTG 3b.)
5. Consider an annual requirement for all students to take an online academic integrity module/tutorial, tailored to their year in school (see also LTG 3a).
6. Create a tips sheet and sanction guidelines that instructors can use when working with students who have engaged in academic misconduct. It is recommended that these guidelines be based on past adjudication data and AITF survey results.
7. Require training for points of contacts in each college – to include associate dean at the college level and then other points of contact from across the college (see STG 2).
8. To sustain communication about academic integrity at UF, prominently feature academic integrity throughout the UF website (to be integrated into broader LTG 1).
9. Determine and implement actions to help transfer students quickly understand the UF Honor Code and the culture of integrity at UF.
10. Expand the length and depth of the presentation on integrity/Honor Code at new faculty orientation.
11. Create an awards process for students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators who are recognized for emulating the Attributes of an Ethical Gator, one of which would be “Integrity.”
12. Involve student organizations (with particular attention to organizations within the Colleges) to discuss development of a peer-to-peer campaign in support of academic integrity (see also LTG 1e).

13. Create a list of frequently asked questions about cheating/plagiarism and other types of academic misconduct to help students more fully understand what is acceptable and what constitutes academic misconduct. Build upon the content already included on the Student Conduct & Conflict Resolution website.
14. Educate faculty and students regarding the capabilities and use of Turnitin.
15. Expand Academic Integrity Week offerings with the recommendation that colleges host specific events during this week.
16. Consult with the College of Engineering, which is developing a program of randomly assigning seats for exams in large classes, and working on technology for ID checking and methods of optimal test distribution during exams. Their pilot programming could become useful for the larger UF community if successful, and provide helpful resources for faculty members.
17. Consider having 2-3 faculty per college per year serve on the UF Student Conduct Committee.

LONG-TERM GOALS – Initiate planning/design within one year and complete implementation within two to three years (potentially implement subcomponents next year)

1. Create a strong culture by doing the following:
 - a. Embed the UF Honor Code in every aspect of the campus community. Maintain, clear, consistent, and routine communication among all community members regarding values, beliefs, and expectations of the high standard of academic integrity at the University of Florida.
 - b. Develop a set of core values, including “integrity,” that are held at a premium by the University of Florida and are readily available and visible through all appropriate communication venues.
 - c. Create a statement of belief regarding academic integrity at UF, and develop University-level events surrounding this creed.
 - d. Launch a highly visible campaign on UF, college and program web sites and promotional materials that identify being a Gator with being ethical – being part of the Gator Nation is having integrity. Campaign needs broad reach and involvement of all major constituents – Administration, Faculty Senate, Faculty, Teaching Assistant’s, Staff, Students, and Community Partners.
 - e. Expand peer-to-peer student campaign on being an ethical Gator. (See STG 12)
2. Create a four-year plan for undergraduates in order to infuse knowledge and enhance awareness of ethical conduct throughout the student’s developmental process (e.g. through existing courses). Each successive year would include specific integrity-related focus areas/experiences. Consider using a model similar to that recommended by the Undergraduate Education Task Force. Create a similar plan for graduate/professional students with population specific educational programming.
3. Directly address student and faculty knowledge, expectations, and skills by doing the following:
 - a. Develop an on-line academic integrity module that all new students are required to complete. The module is intended to address awareness of UF culture, knowledge of academic honesty and misconduct, and behavioral expectations. It

- would also include concrete examples of incorrect and correct methods for completing work (e.g. for using another's work, citing properly).
- b. Develop a faculty module targeted to those early in their UF career to provide information regarding setting the tone in one's own work and expectations of students. It should also incorporate cultural issues that could potentially affect students' understanding of expectations. Finally, it should include information regarding common misperceptions regarding conduct and reporting process (included from STG 4).
 - c. Develop faculty tutorials and/or informational guides that include information on the ways that students are cheating (particularly in light of recent technological advances), best practices in course design and assessment procedures (including, but not limited to, test development and proctoring procedures), and plagiarism detection.
 - d. Develop a faculty training module for those teaching via distance learning, including controls for academic honesty; proctor pools, preventative techniques in course design, etc.
 - e. Train teaching assistants regarding academic integrity principles and UF procedures for managing misconduct. This could be accomplished in part by creating an on-line tutorial. TA supervisors should also provide training in support of a culture of integrity.
 - f. Create adjunct faculty training on integrity (e.g. to include expectations, common student issues related to misconduct and how to manage)
 - g. Create resources outlining how students can be successful in on-line course work, with a component on academic integrity within the context of the on-line environment.
4. Create specific connections between academic integrity and the college/discipline by doing the following:
 - a. Connect the need for integrity in the fields in which the students will be employed and ramifications if ethics are not employed when practicing in their respective fields.
 - b. Include a College/program policy or statement concerning academic integrity during new student activities (e.g. during College sessions of Preview, new student Convocation, etc.)
 - c. Systematically have College/program specific discussions about the Honor Code and ethics as they relate to specific professions
 5. Use First Year Florida as a vehicle for infusing integrity. Create a First Year Florida chapter and instructor resources on ethical decision-making.
 6. Reinforce initial college/programmatic material by doing the following:
 - a. Through each College, develop a multi-year academic integrity educational program for students that, in essence, includes booster sessions for retaining initial information colleges/programs provided as students progress through college and adding material that might be more relevant to upper division or graduate/professional students. (This is distinguished from LTG 3, which is targeted at the university level, although some elements might be shared.)
 - b. Include student educational systems that reinforce college/classroom expectations in program (e.g. might include orientation materials that must be reviewed and passed each year, student orientation to course-specific plagiarism issues at beginning of course and right before major assignments)
 - c. Faculty mentors of junior faculty review guidelines etc. with those faculty as a follow up to an on-line faculty module regarding academic integrity

REFERENCES CITED IN THE REPORT

Radunovich, H. L., Baugh, E., & Turner, R.E. (2009). An examination of students' knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism. *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Journal*, 53(4), 30-35.

Josephson Institute (2010). Josephson Institute's 2010 report card on the ethics of American youth – complete data tables. Available at www.JosephsonInstitute.org or <http://charactercounts.org/programs/reportcard/>.

McCabe, D. L, Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3), 219-232.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *Int. J. for Educational Integrity*, 1(1). Available at <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/14/9>

McCabe, D.L. (1997). Classroom cheating among natural science and engineering majors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 3(4), 433-445.

APPENDIX 1: DATA ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Percent of Respondents to Specific Survey Questions

Question	McCabe (2005)**		
	UG	Grad	Faculty
Unauthorized activities occurring at least once this past year:			
• <i>Working together</i>	42	26	60
• <i>Using cheat sheets or notes</i>	8	4	26
• <i>Using electronic aids during exam</i>	5	2	11
• <i>Learning what's on exam from someone else</i>	33	17	35
• <i>Using unauthorized materials to complete assignments/papers</i>	3	2	29
• <i>Turning in fake excuse for missed exams/ Assignments</i>	16	9	49
• <i>Copying another student on exam or quiz</i>	11	4	41
• <i>Asked by another UF student to plagiarize</i>	9	3	33
Total number of respondents	64,000	9700	9650

**Questions from surveys conducted between 2002 and 2005 were posed asking the student respondent to quantify how often s/he engaged in these behaviors in the past year and the faculty respondent to quantify how often s/he observed these behaviors in the past year. The electronic aids question was recently added with a total undergraduate, graduate, faculty response population of 18,177, 4618, and 2932, respectively. The unauthorized materials question focused specifically on obtaining a paper from a term paper mill.

Percent of Survey Respondents Reported in Various Studies

Question	McCabe et al. (2001)	
	Universities without Honor Code	Universities with Honor Code
<i>Serious test cheating^a</i>	45	30
<i>Serious cheating on written work^b</i>	58	42
<i>All serious cheating</i>	71	54
<i>Copied on test/exam</i>	32	20
<i>Used unauthorized crib notes</i>	17	11
<i>Helped other on test</i>	23	11
<i>Plagiarism</i>	20	10
<i>Copied one or two sentences without footnoting</i>	43	32
<i>Unpermitted collaboration on assignments</i>	49	27

^a Includes copying on an exam (with or without another student's knowledge), using crib notes on an exam, or helping someone else to cheat on a test or exam.

^b Includes plagiarism, fabricated or falsified a bibliography, turned in work done by someone else, or copies a few sentences of material without footnoting them in a paper.

APPENDIX 2: STUDENT BELIEFS REGARDING ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BY COLLEGE

% of Students Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing with Statement

College*	Agree/Strongly Agree that academic misconduct is a significant problem at UF	Agree/Strongly Agree that students violating Honor Code are held accountable
CALS (n=424; 426)	18.9%	55.2%
Business Administration (n=445; 448)	15.5%	57.6%
DCP (n=120; 119)	24.2%	54.6%
Education (n=283; 285)	20.1%	44.2%
Engineering (n=600; 598)	26.0%	49.3%
Fine Arts (n=126; 124)	16.7%	58.1%
HHP (n=165; 167)	21.2%	56.9%
Journalism and Communications (n=170; 170)	14.7%	64.7%
Law (n=108; 108)	26.8%	37.0%
CLAS (n=1115; 1118)	21.9%	52.1%
Medicine (n=83; 83)	25.3%	45.8%
Nursing (n=118; 119)	18.6%	51.2%
Pharmacy (n=369; 371)	12.5%	67.7%
PHPH (n=268; 269)	15.7%	61.0%
Veterinary Medicine (n=58; 58)	25.9%	41.4%
Multiple (n=156; 158)	23.1%	58.9%
Other (n=53; 53)	26.4%	60.4%
Average (n=5423; 5436)	20.5%	54.4%

The *n* represents the total number of students responding to each of the two questions; percentages were calculated after removing those not responding

*Dentistry was not included given a very small number of students responded to these questions and our interest in preserving response anonymity

APPENDIX 3: FACULTY SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPORTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN THE CLASSROOM

Themes from Faculty Comments and Interviews:

- I. Creating Classroom Culture and Expectations**
- II. Preventing/Minimizing Academic Misconduct**
- III. Identifying Academic Misconduct**
- IV. Consequences of Academic Misconduct**

I. Creating Classroom Culture and Expectations/Shaping Student Behavior

1. Use class discussion or chat sessions setting expectations for course, values, and explaining plagiarism and cheating; let students know you value honesty
2. Include policy and consequences for misconduct in syllabus
3. Maintain communication/upfront discussion about repercussions/clarification throughout the course
4. Explain scientific writing and citation requirements; provide explicit lessons/practice in professional writing (synthesizing sources, citation behavior)
5. Make repeated reference to integrity, reinforcing concept and honesty policy prior to each assignment/exam
6. Talk to students about pedagogical reasons for not cheating and use supplemental material to educate (e.g. Misuse of Sources, web links to avoiding plagiarism guides; Student Affairs Academic Dishonesty video) - they learn more, could test knowledge or require certain pass rate for content
7. Learn students' names
8. Encourage students to sign the UF honor code
9. Address faculty dishonesty
10. Meet with students suspected of misunderstanding expectations
11. Let students know you are available to help
12. Announce success in catching students who cheat
13. Invite student who plagiarized in the course in the past to provide personal examples/discuss consequences of plagiarism with students

II. Preventing or Minimizing Academic Misconduct on Exams and Assignments

A. General Exam Management

- a. Use proctors and TA's to monitor potential cheating
- b. Professor personally proctors examinations
- c. Use different test forms
- d. Separate students
- e. Change exams/test problems each semester
- f. Use computer centers/electronic surveillance for exams
- g. Relocate students suspected of cheating near professor, other room
- h. Use essay rather than multiple choice-type exams as make-up exams
- i. Use essay or brief answer exams requiring personal opinions and views or application to lessen potential for academic misconduct; structure exams for quality of thought
- j. No backpacks, hats, or cell phones
- k. Place Honor Code on all exams
- l. Protect/do not return exams to students
- m. Use controlled exams, not take home exams
- n. Small group exams or large room for students to spread out

- o. Provide unique, essay-based take-home exams, keyed to course readings, for each iteration of the course
- p. Use different colored paper for exam
- q. Allow note card during exam in order to “level the playing field”
- r. Use open book tests
- s. Stay abreast of techniques students use to cheat
- t. Make students use the same calculator; some students try to program formulas and definitions into calculators
- u. Clip exam to answer sheet and have student sign

B. On-line Course Exam Delivery

- a. Create list of approved proctors or have credential review standards for individual proctors
- b. Require student verification process via proctor
- c. Set quizzes/tests for certain length of time; give enough questions to fill up allotted time (less time for students to look up answers)
- d. Use regional test sites if possible
- e. Format on-line test questions such that student is given incorrect answer if using search engines
- f. Use scantrons in class instead of E-Learning/Sakai quizzes
- g. Use randomized question bank and randomized answer choices
- h. Use monitored computer labs
- i. Administer exams in oral format over the phone, Skype, computer
- j. Have students sign Honor Code

C. General Assignment Management

1. Explain citation requirements or other issues impacting academic conduct before every assignment
2. Require students to use a plagiarism detection software system; use it as a learning tool
3. Assign a unique or different topic to each student
4. Limit weight of assignments completed outside of class; no outside writing assignments that count much towards grade
5. If assignments aren't controlled, use assignments as formative and not summative; encourage collaborative learning among students
6. Vary written work so papers are not reused
7. Remind students they are still accountable for their own work even though collaborative learning (or study groups for homework) among students is encouraged
8. Use homework problems from texts other than the class text (no solution manuals); use nonstandardized written assignments
9. Use written assignments based on personal experiences and reflection; explore quality of thought about a subject
10. Break assignments into smaller pieces (making it time consuming for students to copy or purchase another's work)
11. Tailor required written responses to specific problem being solved-randomized distribution of problems—assignments do not have specific answers but require deep understanding of material unlikely to be accessed and/or extracted from interpretations existing outside the thought-problem processes of the courses
12. Learn current plagiarism techniques utilized by students

D. Specific Suggestions for Paper Management

1. Allow multiple drafts of papers - e.g. students submit detailed topic information and preliminary research prior to writing first draft, submit detailed first draft prior to finishing paper

2. Have students select and commit to paper topic early, turn in references early
3. Require students to develop original paper topics based on class discussion; assign short, informal response papers earlier in semester to familiarize self about students' writing for when they turn in mid-term and final papers
4. Include process tasks in assignments so instructor can see how students approach and develop final projects; include self-assessments or direct observation of design and implementation
5. Use projects and term papers not available off the web—highly specific to subject discussions in class

III. Identifying Academic Misconduct

1. Use Turnitin.com
2. Use TA's to inspect work for collusion
3. Follow UF procedures to discuss suspected incident with student
4. Google parts of papers such as suspicious phrases
5. If student's writing pattern changes, scrutinize for plagiarized work
6. Use available video or scrutinize improvement if student's performance changes significantly
7. Keep records because student may become a repeat offender

IV. Consequences of Academic Misconduct

1. Make students aware and hold them accountable; enforce sanctions
2. Follow through with UF policies and procedures and recommended sanctions
3. Tell students if anyone exhibits academic misconduct, professor will have the student reported to the University, DSO and sanctioned
4. Invite students found to have plagiarized to discuss consequences with other classes

APPENDIX 4: GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaron, R. M. & Georgia, R. T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. *NASPA Journal*, 31(2), 83-91.
- Adkins, J., Kenkel, C., & Lim, C. L. (2005). Deterrents to on line academic dishonesty. The Journal of Learning in Higher Education, <http://jwpress.com/JLHE/JLHE.htm> 1(1), 17-22.
- Al-Dwairi, Z. N., & Al-Waheidi, E. M. (2004). Cheating behaviors of dental students. *Journal of Dental Education*. 68(11), 1192-1195.
- Alschuler, A. S., & Blimling, G. S. (1995). Curbing epidemic cheating through systemic change. *College Teaching*, 43(4), 123-126.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1987). *Statement of professional Ethics*. Available at <http://www.aaup.org>
- Ashworth, P., & Bannister, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perception of cheating and plagiarism in academics. *Students in Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-204.
- Baggs, J.G. (2008). Issues and rules for authors concerning authorship versus acknowledgements, dual publication, self plagiarism, and Salami publishing. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31, 295-297.
- Baird, J. S. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the School*, 17, 515-522.
- Bates, C. (2007). A student's view: Why cheating matters. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Commentary, 55(24), A36.
- Belter, R., & Pre, A. D. (2009). A strategy to reduce plagiarism in an undergraduate course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36, 257-261.
- Bogle, K. D. (2000). Effect of perspective, type of student, and gender on the attribution of cheating. *Proceedings of the Oklahoma Academy of Science*, 80, 91-97.
- Carpenter, D. D., Harding, T. S., Finelli, C. J., Montgomery, S. M., & Passow, H. J. (2006) Engineering students' perceptions of and attitudes towards cheating. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(3), 181-194.

- Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B., & Ewing, M. (2000). The effect of anomie on academic dishonesty among university students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(1), 23-30.
- Center for Academic Integrity (1999). The fundamental values of academic integrity [Brochure]. Duke University.
- Center for Academic Integrity (CAI). *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. Available at <http://www.academicintegrity.org/pdf/fvProject.pdf>.
- Choi, C.Q. (2009) The Pull of Integrity. *Prism Magazine*. March, 28-33.
- Christensen Hughes, J., & McCabe, D.L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36(1), 49-63.
- Cizek, G. J. (2003). *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc.
- Coalter, T., Lim, C. L., & Wanorie, T. (2007). Factors that influence faculty actions: a study on faculty responses to academic dishonesty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 1-2.
- Crown, D. F., & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 683-700.
- Decoo, W. (2002). *Crisis on campus: confronting academic misconduct*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, K. S., & Yasukawa, H. (1999). College cheating in Japan and the United States. *Research in Higher Education*, 17(3), 343-353.
- Ercegovac, Z., & Richardson, J. V. Jr. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital age: A Literature review. *College and Research Libraries*. 301-317.
- Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. *Educational Records*, 67, 32-36.

- Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perception and institutional action. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 61-81.
- Gross Davis, B. (2002). Preventing academic dishonesty. *Tools for Teaching*. Available at <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/bgd/prevent.html>
- Harding, T., Mayhew, M., Finelli, C., Carpenter, D. (2007). The theory of planned behavior as a model of academic dishonesty in engineering and humanities undergraduates. *Ethics and Behavior*, 17(3), 255-279.
- Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Montgomery, M. S., & Steneck, N. H. (2001). The current state of research on academic dishonesty among engineering students. Paper presented at 31st ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Reno, NV.
- Harris, R. A. (2001). *The plagiarism handbook: Strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*. Los Angeles, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P. F., & Cross, M. (1999). Gender and academic integrity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(4), 345-352.
- Higbee, L. J. & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behavior that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 1(40), 36-52.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reaction to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 401-406.
- Josephson Institute (2010). Josephson Institute's 2010 report card on the ethics of American youth – complete data tables. Available at www.JosephsonInstitute.org or <http://charactercounts.org/programs/reportcard/>.
- Karim, N., Abdul, Z., Nurul H., Nor, Yakinah M. (2009). Exploring the relationship between Internet ethics in university students and the big five model of personality. *Computers and Education*. 53, 86-93.
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Tabachnick, B., Whitley, B., & Washburn, J. (1998). Why professors ignore cheating: Opinions of a national sample of psychology instructors. *Ethics and Behavior*, 8(3), 215-227.

- Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal*, 31(1), 12.
- Kibler, W. L., & Kibler, P. V. (1993). When students report cheating, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39(45), B1-2.
- Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal*, 31(2), 92-101.
- Kisamore, J. L., Stone, T. H., & Jawahar, I.M. (2007). Academic Integrity: The relationship between individual and situational factors on misconduct contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75, 81-394.
- Lathrop, A. & Foss, K. (2000). *Student cheating and plagiarism in the internet area: A wake-up call*. Englewood, CO: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Leming, J. S. (2001). Cheating behavior, situational influence, and moral development. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 214-217.
- Levy, E. S., & Rakovski, C. C. (2006). Academic dishonesty: A zero tolerance professor and student registration choices. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(6), 735-754.
- Love, P. G., & Simmons, J. (1998). Factors influencing cheating and plagiarism among graduate students in a college of education. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 539-550.
- Lupton, R. A., Chapman, K. J., & Weiss, J. E. (2000). A cross-national exploration of business students' attitudes, perceptions, and tendencies toward academic dishonesty. *Journal of Education and Business*, 75(4), 231-235.
- Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college students. Washington, DC: Office of Research, U. S. Department of Education.
- McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty response to academic dishonesty: The influences of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education*, 34, 647-658.
- McCabe, D.L. (1997). Classroom cheating among natural science and engineering majors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 3(4), 433-445

- McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *Int. J. for Educational Integrity*, 1(1). Available at <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/14/9>
- McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: academic dishonesty and educational opportunities. *Liberal Education*, 91, 26-32.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor code and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 520-538.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college. *Change*, 28, 28-33.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(2), 211-234.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3), 219-232.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in academic environments: The influence of peer reporting requirements. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(1), 30-44.
- McGrath Cohoon, J., & Rogers, A.E. (2003). Little Too Much Help From Their Friends. North Central Sociological Association 2003 NCSA Conference.
- Molnar, K., Kletke, M., & Chongwatpol, J. (2008). Ethics vs. IT ethics: Do undergraduate students perceive a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83, 657-671.
- Nadelson, S. (2007). Academic misconduct by university students: Faculty perceptions and responses. . *Plagiarism: Cross Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification*, 2(2), 1-10.
- Noah, H. J., & Eckstein, M. A. (2001). *Fraud and education: The worm in the apple*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, Inc.

- Nonis, S., & Swift, C. (1998). Deterring cheating behaviors in the marketing classroom: An analysis of the effects of demographics, attitudes, and in-class deterrent strategies. *Journal of Marketing Education, 20*(3), 188-200.
- Nonis, S. & Swift, C. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(2), 69-77.
- Nuss, E. M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. *Improving College and University Teaching, 34*(3), 140-144.
- Parameswaran, A., & Devi, P. (2006). Student plagiarism and faculty responsibility in undergraduate engineering labs. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(3), 263-276.
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: plagiarism by university students- literature and lesson. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488.
- Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Hardy, T. S. and Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(6), 643-684.
- Pavela, G. (1997). Faculty attitudes toward academic integrity. *Synthesis; Law and Policy in Higher Education, 9*(1), 642-644.
- Perfect, T. J., & Stark, L.J. (2008). Why do I always have the best ideas? The role of idea quality in unconscious plagiarism. *Memory, 16* (4), 386-394.
- Petress, K. C. (2003). Academic dishonesty: A plague on your profession. *Education, 123*(3), 624-627.
- Prenshaw, P. J., Straughan, R. D., & Albers-Miller, N.D. (2001). University Academic Dishonesty Policy and Student Perceptions of Cheating: An Exploratory Content Analysis Across Fourteen Universities. Available at <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/research/acme/2001/45.pdf>

- Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Journal of Higher Education, 74*(2), 196-209.
- Rabi, S.M., Patton, L R., Fjortoft, N., & Zgarrick, D. (2006). Characteristics, prevalence, attitudes, and perceptions of academic honesty among pharmacy students. *American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, 70* (4), Article 73, 1-8.
- Radunovich, H. L., Baugh, E., & Turner, R. E. (2009). An examination of students' knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism. *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Journal, 53*(4), 30-35.
- Roberts-Cady, S. (2008). The role of critical thinking in academic dishonesty policies. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 4*(2), 60-66.
- Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics and Behavior, 11*(3), 307-323. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Roig, M. (2009). The Debate of self-plagiarism: Inquisitional science or high standards of scholarship? *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies, 8*, 245-258.
- Rosen, B. (1980). The teaching of undergraduate ethics. In D. Callahan, and S. Bok (Eds), *Ethics teaching in higher education*, (pp. 171-190). New York: Plenum Press.
- Ruderman, J. (2004), Faculty play a critical academic integrity role. *Academic Leader, 20*(3), 8-9.
- Ryan, G., Bonanno, H., Drass, I., Scouller, K., & Smith, L. (2009). Undergraduate and postgraduate pharmacy student's perceptions of plagiarism and academic honesty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 73* (6), Article 105, 1-8.
- Saddlemire, M. T. (2005). Faculty perceptions of undergraduate academic dishonesty. (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University).
- Schneider, A. (1999). Why professors don't do more to stop students who cheat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(20), A8-A11.
- Selingo, J. (2004). The cheating culture. *ASSEE Prism, 14*(1), 24-30.

- Selwyn, N. (2008). A safe haven for misbehaving? An investigation of online misbehavior among university students. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26(4), 446-465.
- Selwyn, N. (2008). Not necessarily a bad thing...: a study of online plagiarism amongst undergraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 465-479.
- Shon, P.C.H. (2006). How college students cheat on in-class examinations: Creativity, strain, and techniques of innovation. *Plagiarism: Cross Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification*, 1 (10), 1-20.
- Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Oleson, T., Ressel, M. (2003). The other side of academic dishonesty: The relationship between faculty scepticism, gender and strategies for managing student academic dishonesty cases. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 193-207.
- Storch, E. (2002) Fraternities, sororities, and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 36(2), 247-252. Available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_2_36/ai_89809975/?tag=content:col1.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). The tangled web, Internet plagiarism and international students' academic writing. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 15(1), 15-19.
- Thompson, C. (2006). Unintended lessons: plagiarism and the university. *Teachers College Record*, 108 (12), 2439-2449.
- Vandehey, M.A., Diekhoff, G.M., & LaBeff, E.E. (2007). College cheating: A twenty-year follow-up and the addition of honor code. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 468-479.
- Whitley, B. E. Jr. & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Zimny, S., Robertson, D., & Bartoszek, T. (2008). Academic and personal dishonesty in college students. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 291-312.