

Summary Report

FIU Faculty & Student Academic Integrity Survey

Presented on

November 21, 2015

Submitted by

Valerie George, Ph.D.

FIU Fellow for Academic Integrity
Chair, FIU Academic Integrity Committee

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2014, the FIU Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) discussed the importance of having a greater understanding of factors influencing academic integrity (AI) at FIU. The AIC determined that in their first year (2014-2015), one of the main goals should be to learn more about the perceptions and awareness about misconduct (i.e., opinions about and response to FIU's policies and penalties for cheating, beliefs and observation regarding frequency of misconduct, student reporting of cheating and misconduct in online courses, sources for information about academic integrity and misconduct and social or personal influences on cheating).

Thereafter, the members of the committee set out to find potential assessment tools which would help address this goal. After reviewing a number of different survey instruments, it was decided that the surveys provided through the International Center for Academic integrity (ICAI) for student and faculty would be the best choice to provide baseline information. The ICAI surveys have been implemented at a number of institutions of higher education across the country. The AIC believed this to be advantageous as it could be possible to consider FIU results in reference to the results of other institutions.

The ICAI surveys for faculty and students were originally developed by Dr. Donald McCabe (1993). Additional information on the survey can be found through the ICAI website <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/about-1.php>. Dr. McCabe was also instrumental in the creation of The ICAI in 1992. The mission of the ICAI is as follows:

“The International Center for Academic Integrity was founded to combat cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty in higher education. Its mission has since expanded to include the cultivation of cultures of integrity in academic communities throughout the world. ICAI offers assessment services, resources, and consultations to its member institutions, and facilitates conversations on academic integrity topics each year at its annual conference.”

Access to these surveys was through the purchase of the ICAI *Academic Integrity Assessment Guide* which was purchased by FIU in November 2014. In the agreement with the ICAI all statistical analyses on the surveys were to be completed by the ICAI and the administration of the surveys done through an on-line link provided through ICAI and facilitated by *SurveyGizmo*. Copies of the Faculty and Student Surveys can be found in *Appendices C and D*. In order to proceed with the survey implementation, an application to conduct research was submitted to FIU Sponsored Research in January 2015 and the IRB was approved in February 2015 with Dr. Valerie George surveying as Principal Investigator.

On April 1, 2015, the AI Faculty Survey was included as a link to an email sent to all faculty by Kathleen Wilson, Chair of the Faculty Senate. The AI Student Survey was sent out on April 1, 2015 to all graduate students through a link provided in an email from the Graduate School. The Student Government Association (SGA) sent out an email with an invitation to participate in the survey and the link to the survey on April 10, 2015. In all email announcements, all potential participants were told that completion of the survey was completely voluntary and that all information they provided would be anonymous. The links for the surveys remained open until May 4, 2015 to increase the chance for an optimum response rate.

RESULTS

Participants

Faculty

The survey was sent out to 3,600 faculty, this included 1,889 adjuncts. The response rate to the survey was ~ 10%. The faculty who responded to the survey were 48% male, 51% female and 1% transgender or other gender identity. Table 1 presents descriptive information on; a) area of primary teaching responsibility, b) number of years the faculty reported teaching at a university level and c) rank. The majority of the participants (44.7%) were from Arts and Sciences. Approximately a third reported teaching for > 20 years, 19% for 5-9 years and 23% for < 5 years. The predominant academic ranks were Full Professor (20.5%), Associate Professor (19.4%) and Adjunct Professors (21.4%).

Table 1
Faculty's primary area of teaching responsibility,
number of years teaching at university level, and rank

| Primary area of teaching (n= 337) | n | % |
|--|------------|-------------|
| College of Architecture & Arts | 14 | 4.2 |
| College of Arts and Sciences | 150 | 44.5 |
| College of Business | 41 | 12.2 |
| College of Education | 24 | 7.1 |
| College of Engineering & Computing | 20 | 5.9 |
| Honors College | 5 | 1.5 |
| College of Law | 2 | 0.6 |
| College of Medicine | 11 | 3.1 |
| School of Hospitality & Tourism Management | 10 | 3.0 |
| School of Journalism & Mass Communication | 12 | 3.6 |
| College of Public Health & Social Work | 24 | 7.1 |
| College of Nursing & Health Sciences | 17 | 5.0 |
| Other | 7 | 2.1 |
| Number of years teaching at university level (n= 342) | | |
| < 5 years | 79 | 23.1 |
| 5-9 years | 66 | 19.3 |
| 10-14 years | 56 | 16.4 |
| 15-19 years | 38 | 11.1 |
| > 20 years | 103 | 30.1 |
| Academic Rank (n = 341) | | |
| Assistant Professor | 51 | 15 |
| Associate Professor | 66 | 19.4 |
| Full Professor | 70 | 20.5 |
| Adjunct Professor | 73 | 21.4 |
| Digital Instructor | 3 | 0.9 |
| Clinical Assistant Professor | 10 | 2.9 |
| Clinical Associate Professor | 3 | 0.9 |
| Instructor/Lecturer | 57 | 16.7 |

Students (n = 640)

The survey was sent to **53,338** students of which 8,723 were graduate students and 44,615 undergraduate students. The response rate for the graduate students (n= 318) was ~ 3.6% and was less than one percent for undergraduate students (n= 320). Overall, more female students, 61.5% vs. 38% male, and 0.5% transgender or other gender, responded to the survey. The majority of graduate students (77%) were master's students. The majority of the students were domestic 91% vs 9% international. The majority of the students (77%) were full time versus 23% part-time.

The highest percentage of respondents (48.5%) were in the age range 25-39 years of age, followed by 35.1% (18-24 years of age). The smallest percentage (16.4%) were in the age range age range >40 years. The majority of the students (35.6%) were in College of Arts and Sciences and the majority (57 %) of the students who responded to the survey had a GPA in the range of 3.50-4.00 (see Table 2).

Table 2
School/college of primary major and GPA of participating students

| Major Area (n= 630) | n | % |
|--|------------|-------------|
| College of Architecture & Arts | 19 | 3.0 |
| College of Arts and Sciences | 224 | 35.6 |
| College of Business | 144 | 22.9 |
| College of Education | 43 | 6.8 |
| College of Engineering & Computing | 79 | 12.5 |
| College of Law | 10 | 1.6 |
| College of Medicine | 5 | 0.8 |
| School of Hospitality & Tourism Management | 19 | 3.0 |
| School of Journalism & Mass Communication | 10 | 1.6 |
| College of Public Health & Social Work | 37 | 5.9 |
| College of Nursing & Health Sciences | 28 | 4.4 |
| Other | 12 | 1.9 |
| Student GPA n= 640 | | |
| 4.00 - 3.50 | 364 | 56.9 |
| 3.49 - 3.00 | 175 | 27.3 |
| 2.99 - 2.50 | 78 | 12.2 |
| 2.49 - 2.00 | 20 | 3.1 |
| > 2.00 | 3 | 0.5 |

Opinions about policies and penalties

Overall, when students were asked about the extent to whether or not they had a clear understanding of FIU policies regarding academic honesty, 31.2% reported greatly, 29.8% a lot, 27.1 % average, 9.0% a little and 2.9% not at all. Table 3 provides information about the opinions of faculty and students (graduate and undergraduate) about the policies and penalties for cheating at FIU. These results suggest that there is a discrepancy between faculty and students on a number of issues. For example, almost 50% of the students versus 12% of the faculty reported that the average student’s understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating was high-very high.

In reference to faculty's beliefs about faculty understanding, 37% of the faculty versus 80% of the students reported that the faculty's understanding of these policies was high-very high. More importantly, almost 50% of the faculty reported that student support of the policies was very low –low, even though ~ 45% of the students reported that their support was high-very high.

Table 3
Opinions of faculty and students about policies and penalties for cheating at FIU*

| | Very Low | Low | Medium | High | Very High |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| The average student's understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=350) | 17.2 | 37.4 | 33.4 | 10.0 | 2.0 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=313) | 10.2 | 15.7 | 30.4 | 26.8 | 16.9 |
| Undergraduate (n=315) | 6.7 | 11.7 | 27.3 | 33.7 | 20.6 |
| Faculty's understanding of these policies | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=350) | 4.9 | 18.6 | 39.7 | 28.9 | 8.0 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=313) | 3.5 | 3.8 | 16.0 | 35.1 | 41.5 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 2.2 | 1.9 | 11.6 | 36.8 | 47.5 |
| Student support of these policies | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=346) | 13.9 | 35.8 | 36.7 | 13.0 | 0.6 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=311) | 8.0 | 14.1 | 33.1 | 27.3 | 17.4 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 9.4 | 13.2 | 31.4 | 30.5 | 15.4 |
| Faculty support of these policies | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=348) | 6.3 | 16.1 | 33.9 | 32.5 | 11.2 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=312) | 4.5 | 7.4 | 17.3 | 31.7 | 39.1 |
| Undergraduate (n=319) | 2.2 | 3.8 | 17.2 | 35.4 | 41.4 |
| The effectiveness of these policies | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=349) | 18.1 | 30.4 | 36.7 | 12.3 | 2.6 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=312) | 11.5 | 12.2 | 27.9 | 26.9 | 21.5 |
| Undergraduate (n=315) | 5.7 | 12.7 | 28.3 | 30.5 | 22.9 |
| The severity of penalties for cheating at FIU | | | | | |
| FACULTY (n=348) | 14.7 | 25.6 | 37.6 | 18.4 | 3.7 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=311) | 7.1 | 9.6 | 19.9. | 35.7 | 27.7 |
| Undergraduate (n=315) | 4.1 | 3.2 | 17.1 | 40.0 | 35.6 |

*% Response

In terms of faculty support for the policies, ~44% of the faculty indicated high-very high level and ~34% medium, **suggesting that the majority, >75% of the faculty supported the current policies** However, in terms of effectiveness of these policies, almost fifty percent of the faculty reported very low-low. This is in contrast to the students who (> 50%) indicated that the effectiveness of these policies was high-very high. Over 40% of the faculty reported that the penalties for cheating were very low to low versus 70% of the students that indicated that the penalties were high –very high.

Beliefs of faculty and students about the frequency of misconduct

Table 4 provides information on beliefs of faculty and students about the frequency of misconduct. In reference to *plagiarism*, faculty reported plagiarism on written assignment as occurring often (39.5%) and very often (20%), ~ 60% of the time in contrast to students (graduate vs undergraduate) who reported this often (21% vs 17%) and very often (18%) for both graduate and undergraduates. This suggests that the faculty believe that plagiarism occurs more frequently than students. In terms of *inappropriately sharing work in group assignments*, again faculty reported that the frequency was higher (often-very often), 63% versus 47% by the students for this frequency range. **In reference to cheating during test or examination, ~30% of the faculty and students reported that they think this occurs often-very often.**

In reference to *submitting the same paper in more than one course without specific permission*, 35% of the faculty reported they think this happened often-very often versus 36% of the graduate students and 20% of the undergraduate students. In reference to *purchasing papers*, 15% of the graduate students responded that this occurred often-very often versus 24% of the undergraduate students. Approximately a quarter of the graduate and undergraduate students indicated that the frequency for using *electronic /digital devices as unauthorized aid during an in-class test* was often-very often. Finally, only 8% of the graduate students and 10% of the undergraduates reported that *falsifying information on an exam or paper after it has been graded/ submitted* occurred often-very often. **In summary, students inappropriately sharing work in group assignments and plagiarism on written assignments were reported by the highest percentage of faculty and students to be the most frequent type of misconduct.**

Table 4
Beliefs of faculty and students about frequency of misconduct*

| <i>How frequently do you think the following occur at FIU?</i> | Never | Very seldom | Some times | Often | Very Often |
|--|-------|-------------|------------|-------|------------|
| Plagiarisms on written assignments FACULTY (n=349) | 0.6 | 2.9 | 36.9 | 39.5 | 20.1 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=315) | 5.1 | 23.2 | 32.7 | 20.6 | 18.4 |
| Undergraduate (n=319) | 4.1 | 23.8 | 36.7 | 16.9 | 18.5 |
| Students inappropriately sharing work in group assignments FACULTY (n =349) | 1.1 | 6.3 | 29.3 | 37.5 | 25.8 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=315) | 7.3 | 18.1 | 27.0 | 26.3 | 21.3 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 6.0 | 21.1 | 27.0 | 21.4 | 24.5 |
| Cheating during tests or examinations FACULTY (n =347) | 1.2 | 17.3 | 46.4 | 24.5 | 10.7 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=314) | 9.9 | 29.3 | 29.3 | 15.3 | 16.2 |
| Undergraduate (n=315) | 11.3 | 28.9 | 24.8 | 16.7 | 18.2 |
| Submitting the same paper in more than one course without specific permission FACULTY (n =345) | 2.0 | 16.5 | 46.1 | 22.3 | 13.3 |
| STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=311) | 18.7 | 27.3 | 31.1 | 15.9 | 7.0 |
| Undergraduate (n=317) | 21.1 | 30.6 | 28.4 | 9.1 | 10.7 |
| Purchasing papers Graduate (n=315) | 24.8 | 32.7 | 27.6 | 10.2 | 4.8 |
| Undergraduate (n=319) | 23.1 | 33.9 | 19.3 | 12.0 | 11.7 |
| Use of electronic /digital devices as unauthorized academic aids during an in-class test Graduate (n=313) | 19.8 | 30.7 | 24.0 | 14.7 | 10.9 |
| Undergraduate (n =315) | 21.1 | 27.4 | 24.2 | 11.6 | 15.7 |
| Falsifying information on an exam or paper after it has been graded/submitted Graduate (n=314) | 33.8 | 41.4 | 16.9 | 4.8 | 3.2 |
| Undergraduate (n=317) | 38.2 | 35.6 | 16.1 | 4.1 | 6.0 |

*(%) Responses

Being informed about FIU policies, reporting cheating and online misconduct

Table 5 illustrates the response of students (graduate and undergraduate) to a number of questions regarding FIU’s policy on cheating and academic misconduct, the majority $\geq 90\%$ reported being informed about the policies. Although as indicated in an earlier, (see Table 3) this does not necessarily mean that they understand the policies.

Only 5% of the undergraduate students and 15% of the graduate students indicated that they had reported another student cheating. More undergraduates 87% versus 65% of the graduate students had taken an online test or exam. For students taking classes on line, in terms of misconduct, the highest percentage of students (26% of graduates versus 20% of undergraduates) reported using notes or books on a closed book exam and 20% of the graduates versus 16% of the undergraduates reported looking up information on the internet when not permitted and >10% reported collaborating with others when not permitted. **There may be more opportunities for misconduct during an online exam than in-person exam, although the questions in this survey were not directed at making this comparison.**

Table 5
Positive responses of students to questions on being informed on academic integrity policy, reporting cheating and participation in misconduct in an online course*

| | Graduate (n =312) | Undergraduate (n = 318) |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Informed about academic integrity or cheating polices at FIU | 90 | 92 |
| Reported another student for cheating? | 15 | 5 |
| Taken an online test or exam at FIU | 65 | 87 |
| If you have ever taken an online course have you ever? | | |
| a) Collaborated with others during the online test when not permitted? | 12 | 12 |
| b) Used notes or books on a closed book online test or exam? | 26 | 20 |
| c) Received unauthorized help from someone on an online test? | 8 | 6 |
| d) Looked up information on the internet when not permitted? | 20 | 16 |

*% Response

Sources of information about academic and misconduct policies

In reference to sources of information for FIU’s academic misconduct policies, in descending order for graduate versus undergraduate students they were, *syllabus* 60% versus 70%, *first year orientation* 34% versus 39% and *student handbook*, 34% vs 35% respectively (see Table 5S). The campus websites, counselors and advisors, teaching assistants, other students and deans or other administrators were reported by a smaller percentage of the students to be a source of information. **Perhaps these groups could have a greater involvement in promoting academic integrity and academic misconduct policy in the future.**

Table 6
Sources for information about academic integrity and misconduct*

| <i>If you were informed about academic integrity and cheating policies at FIU, where and how much have you learned about the policies?</i> | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Learned | Nothing | A Little | Some | A lot | Not applicable |
| <i>1st year orientation</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (288) | 14.9 | 11.8 | 22.9 | 34.4 | 16.0 |
| Undergraduate (305) | 8.9 | 7.5 | 26.2 | 39.0 | 28.4 |
| <i>Campus Website</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (289) | 24.9 | 17.3 | 21.8 | 22.1 | 13.8 |
| Undergraduate (306) | 20.3 | 18.3 | 20.3 | 24.5 | 16.7 |
| <i>Student Handbook</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (288) | 14.6 | 15.3 | 25.0 | 33.7 | 11.5 |
| Undergraduate (306) | 11.1 | 10.1 | 27.8 | 35.3 | 15.7 |
| <i>Advisor or Counselor</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (306) | 24.4 | 13.2 | 17.8 | 28.2 | 16.4 |
| Undergraduate (288) | 24.2 | 12.1 | 18.6 | 23.9 | 21.2 |
| <i>Other Students</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (304) | 30.6 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 13.2 | 9.7 |
| Undergraduate (288) | 33.2 | 17.8 | 16.1 | 15.1 | 17.8 |
| <i>Faculty (syllabus)</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (290) | 4.5 | 6.2 | 25.2 | 60.3 | 3.8 |
| Undergraduate (306) | 1.6 | 6.5 | 18.3 | 70.3 | 3.3 |
| <i>Teaching Assistant</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (288) | 31.9 | 9.7 | 15.3 | 16.3 | 26.7 |
| Undergraduate (303) | 22.1 | 11.9 | 16.8 | 23.1 | 26.1 |
| <i>Dean or other administrator</i> | | | | | |
| Graduate (289) | 38.8 | 9.0 | 13.8 | 16.6 | 21.8 |
| Undergraduate (301) | 33.2 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 13.6 | 32.2 |

* (%)

Cheating observation and social and personal influences

Students were also asked about their observation of cheating and about half reported that they had never seen students cheat, ~ 20% reported they had witnessed this a few times, 16% of the graduate students versus 17% of undergraduates reported that they had seen this several-many times. In reference to social or personal influences on cheating, the most influential was parents (see Table 7).

Table 7
Social or personal influences on cheating*

| | Very Strongly | Fairly Strongly | Not Very Strongly | Not at All |
|---|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|
| If you had cheated in a course and the following individuals knew about it, how strongly do you believe they would disapprove? | | | | |
| <i>A Close Friend</i> | | | | |
| Graduate (n=310) | 43 | 23 | 22 | 12 |
| Undergraduate (n =317) | 29 | 23 | 27 | 21 |
| <i>Someone in your social group or casual acquaintance</i> | | | | |
| Graduate (n=309) | 41 | 23 | 24 | 12 |
| Undergraduate (n= 316) | 24 | 25 | 30 | 21 |
| <i>Your parents</i> | | | | |
| Graduate (n=308) | 70 | 16 | 8 | 6 |
| Undergraduate (n =316) | 65 | 21 | 7 | 7 |

*% Response

Frequency of instructors providing information on misconduct issues

When students were asked to report on information provided by their instructor on specific issues regarding misconduct (see Table 8), 47.5% of the graduate students versus 70.9% of the undergraduate students reported that plagiarism was discussed often-very often. Fifty two percent of the graduate students and 58.4% of the undergraduate reported that guidelines on group work or collaboration was discussed often-very often and 66.6% of graduate students and 73.7% of undergraduates reported that proper citation methods were discussed by the faculty often-very often. Falsifying or fabricating lab data was reported to be discussed less, with only 36% of graduate students and 48% of the undergraduate students reporting that faculty discussed this often-very often respectively.

Qualitative Responses

The survey also provided the opportunity for qualitative responses in reference to improving policies or changes that could be made to support academic integrity or successful strategies to address academic dishonesty. Examples of the qualitative results from faculty and students can be found in Appendices A and B respectively. These responses can provide greater insight into specific concerns about misconduct as well as efforts and ideas to support and cultivate academic integrity at FIU.

Table 8

Frequency of instructors discussing misconduct issues*

| | Never | Seldom | Some times | Often | Very Often |
|---|-------|--------|------------|-------|------------|
| Plagiarism | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=315) | 7.9 | 12.7 | 21.9 | 28.9 | 28.6 |
| Undergraduate (n=319) | 2.2 | 7.5 | 19.4 | 32.0 | 38.9 |
| Guidelines on group work or collaboration | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=315) | 13.3 | 14.0 | 17.5 | 29.8 | 25.4 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 6.0 | 15.7 | 19.8 | 31.4 | 27.0 |
| Proper citation/referencing of written sources | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=315) | 6.7 | 9.8 | 16.8 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 3.8 | 10.1 | 13.5 | 34.6 | 38.1 |
| Proper citation/referencing of internet sources | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=314) | 7.3 | 12.4 | 18.5 | 29.9 | 31.9 |
| Undergraduate (n=318) | 4.7 | 11.0 | 13.8 | 33.6 | 36.8 |
| Falsifying/fabricating lab data | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=313) | 36.4 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 16.3 | 19.8 |
| Undergraduate (n=316) | 24.1 | 12.7 | 15.5 | 23.4 | 24.4 |
| Falsifying/fabricating research data | | | | | |
| Graduate (n=313) | 28.4 | 14.4 | 16.3 | 18.5 | 22.4 |
| Undergraduate (n =316) | 22.2 | 13.3 | 14.6 | 25.0 | 25.0 |

* % Response

Summary

The FIU Academic Integrity Survey was a first attempt to get baseline information about a number of factors that might influence academic integrity and student misconduct including:

- a) Opinions about and response to FIU's policies and penalties for cheating
- b) Beliefs/perceptions and observation regarding frequency of misconduct
- c) Student reporting of cheating and misconduct in online testing
- d) Sources for information about academic integrity and misconduct
- e) Social or personal influences on cheating

As with many surveys with students and faculty, low response rate is a concern. According to the ICAI, the aggregate response rate (2014-2015) of six universities excluding FIU who also administered the Academic Integrity survey, the response rate was 9%. The response rate to Academic Integrity surveys conducted at the University in Florida as reported in their 2011 Academic Integrity Task Force Report indicated a response rate of 28% from the faculty and

12.7 % from the students. Whether our lower student response rate indicates a lack of interest about academic integrity or if the low response rate was due to limited marketing before the survey was implemented is unknown. We were not able to implement the student survey until late in the spring semester. Perhaps future attempts to assess students would be more successful mid fall or early in the spring semester.

The response to different questions regarding academic integrity from students at FIU were for the most part comparable to the responses of students represented by the aggregate data from ICAI with the exception of the response to a few questions including the severity of penalties for cheating. Seventy five percent of the undergraduate students rated the severity as high-very high compared to a response rate of 59% from the ICAI aggregate data. In reference to the sources for information about academic integrity and misconduct, results were comparable for most items except for information from advisor or counselor ~24% of FIU students responded “a lot” versus 33% ICAI aggregate data, and information from dean or administrator ~ 14% of FIU students responded a lot versus 22% ICAI aggregate data. In regards to seeing other students cheat, 16% of the FIU students reported that they had seen this several to many times versus 9% ICAI aggregate data.

Although the response rate to this first Academic Integrity survey was relatively low, the quantitative and qualitative information does provide insight into the issues and challenges we face in an endeavor to further cultivate an environment of academic integrity. We are not alone in this challenge, as it has been estimated that approximately seventy five percent of college students have reported they have committed misconduct at least once in their academic experience (Vandehey et al, 2007).

The reason for this behavior is based on a number of factors; pedagogical, cultural, economic, environmental, social, intellectual as well as technological. For example, in the book entitled, *The Word* (2009), by Susan Blum, she suggests that in our technological driven society, where information is available at a touch of finger, it can be difficult for students to understand where individual ownership and acknowledgement lies and the boundaries of “my work” and “our work”. This could contribute to issues associated with plagiarism.

The system is further complicated and sometimes strained because of the rapid increase in new modalities of teaching and learning (on-line courses, hybrid courses, MOOC). In addition, many universities may not have enough available trained faculty to teach all courses, thus students may not get the assistance needed for them to successfully understand the course material. In such instances, students may use information from other sources without consideration of ownership. Finally, what is perceived as accepted norms with regard to academic integrity and misconduct seems to vary among institutions (Arum and Roksa, 2011) and in some places, academic misconduct may even be supported by peers or peer perceived norms (Lange, 2013).

For some in academia such considerations may not seem relevant and thus the issues associated with academic integrity are minimized. In other instances, faculty are overwhelmed with their workload. They may decide that going through the formal processes associated with student misconduct or addressing issues of misconduct among peers is too complicated and may not result in successful outcomes. Thus, apathy prevails and can set a tone of indifference in the educational institution regarding issues of academic integrity. But, unless addressed, lack of academic integrity and academic misconduct can slowly diminish the quality of the educational system.

In order to address these issues, there must be a commitment to creating a strong culture of academic integrity. At FIU, as in other institutions this is challenging, not only because of the diversity of our students and faculty but also the changing times-new technology, financial restraints as well as fluctuations in the priorities for students, faculty and administration. Therefore, it is essential that we develop and support effective lines of communication among all member of the academic community. Through this process the bedrock values and expectations of the university should be discussed and emphasized. In addition, greater communication will enhance awareness of policies and procedures for misconduct and grievance and clarify options to address issues of academic integrity.

Ultimately the goal of any educational institution is to graduate students that have obtained the knowledge they need to be competent in their field, developed critical thinking skills to help

them make good decisions and supported the student in their personal and professional growth as good citizens. Creating a strong foundation that upholds the values of the university and a plan to support academic integrity is key to the success for all. Students who have problems with academic misconduct may be delayed in their academic progression. This could have an impact on FIU's efforts to meet the FIU *Beyond Possible 2020* performance indicator goals for timely graduation and graduation without excess hours. Therefore, it is important that we have a comprehensive plan to support academic integrity at FIU.

Recommendations

1. **Planning**-Creation of a strategic plan for the university to cultivate academic integrity based on the ICAI Guide and or other models for cultivating academic integrity. This includes planning for methods to periodically assess factors influencing academic integrity and getting regular feedback from faculty and students about the impact of any types of intervention (i.e., experience using the policies and procedures, response to social media messages).
2. **Policies**- Regular review of policies to determine if they are meeting the needs of faculty, students and administrative so that we are assured that there is a fair and effective process to address academic misconduct and grievance.
3. **Procedures**-Quality control and accountability as well as the establishment of effective systems to ensure that procedures are understood by faculty, students and administration and that they are carried out expeditiously.
4. **Promotion**-
 - a. On-going discussion of academic integrity through the media, including the university newspaper, radio programs, TED talks, as well as other social media and campus events.
 - b. Creation of physical and visual images (i.e., sculpture, bricks, posters, banners, on-line images of the values associated with academic integrity).
 - c. Better and more regular use of the Student Pledge associated with the FIU Code of Academic Integrity-including this as part of exams or part of assignment requirements. Posters readily visible in classroom and public spaces with this code.
5. **Pedagogy**
 - a. Information in all classes on how to avoid plagiarism and method for correct citation
 - b. Syllabi with specific information about the policies and procedures regarding misconduct with an explanation by the faculty including examples of possible sanctions.
 - c. Emphasis on mastery over performance-use lower stake testing
 - d. Changing assignments year to year
 - e. Clarifying learning objectives
 - f. Assessing higher level of thought (critical thinking)
 - g. Varying assignment format
 - h. Including information on the ethical decision making process in courses
6. **Prevention**
 - a. More proctors available to assist in large classes during exams
 - b. Spacing between students in rooms of adequate size for test taking
 - c. Elimination of technology during test taking (i.e., phone, iPad)
7. **Programs**
 - a. Education for new faculty on issues associated with academic integrity as well as explanation of the current policies and procedures.
 - b. Workshops for all part time faculty or on-line instructor to help them understand the issues around academic integrity as well as current policies and procedures.

- c. Education for all students including transfer and graduate students about policies and procedures as well as strategies for academic success including time management and effective communication.
- d. An interactive course for undergraduate and graduate students. This would be an innovation and a unique asset to FIU and our programs. This could be an on-line module with an introductory message from the president. In this module information and discussion would provide illustrations and examples to students about issues (i.e., plagiarism, cheating, group work) related to academic integrity. The module would also show students methods for ethical decision making.
- e. Inclusion of the understanding regarding academic integrity as a learning outcome as part of general education course requirements. For example, this could include proper citation methods as well as components of ethical decision making.
- f. Making information about academic integrity a part of the mentorship program for new faculty and TA's.
- g. Providing "Best Practices" (i.e., type of exams, turnitin, evaluation methods, etc.) to faculty and TA's who are teaching face to face or on-line.

References

- Arum, Richard and Roksa, Josipa. 2011. *Academically adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Blum, Susan D. 2009. *My Word, Plagiarism and College Culture*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Lang, J. M. (2013). *Cheating Lessons-Learning from Academic Dishonesty*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Vandehey, M. A., Diekhoff G. M., Labeff E. E. (2007). College cheating: a twenty-year follow-up and the addition of an honor code'. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, pp. 468–480.

Appendices

- Appendix A Faculty Qualitative Responses (examples)
- Appendix B Student Qualitative Responses (examples)
- Appendix C Faculty ACADEMIC INTEGRITY Surveys
- Appendix C Student ACADEMIC INTEGRITY Survey

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the students and faculty that took the time to participate in this survey and provide feedback and insight into their beliefs, attitudes and concerns regarding Academic integrity at FIU.

Appendix A Faculty Qualitative Responses (examples)

Policies and procedures:

- Better instruction of rules and publicizing of action when students violate the rules.
- Continue using existing protocols.
- Create a workable version of the academic dishonesty reporting system for fully-online courses.
- Create greater awareness and reinforce it regularly each semester
- Discuss the issues in formal settings with students and faculty.
- Freshman and transfer students should have an orientation about FIU's policies
- Have first year information/practical workshops
- Include the topic in a departmental meeting each year.
- Allow departments to establish a standard on plagiarism-
- Make every student sign a sheet attached to the syllabus that says their signature and date attest to the fact that they agree to follow the University Code of Conduct regarding Academic Honesty.
- Make it clear what faculty are and are not supposed to do when cheating is suspected, offer an online seminar for faculty on what to do.
- Provide an online seminar/tutorial for students that can be assigned by faculty. Include a quiz on the material with a high score requirement at the end and a statement that by doing so well on the quiz, it is assumed that the student is now aware and cannot use a lack of understanding as an excuse.
- Have someone in the writing center who can come in and do a 15 min presentation on references/citations.
- Enforce to faculty to report cases when they encounter them. The cases I encounter and report (as department chair), students are often angry because they have gotten away with it before.
- As I understand the policy and practices it is generally too much work with only limited benefits to formally charge a student with academic dishonesty. I generally work out a solution myself.
- Requirement that a faculty member's supervisor (department chair) be present for the conversation between the faculty. This might seem like a minor thing, but I have found it myself to be a bit of a roadblock to the informal resolution: it tends to make a purely individual process the path of the least resistance. Finally, I wish there were more clear guidance about what to do if, as often happens, the student fails to respond to a faculty member's call for a meeting to discuss a plagiarism

Culture of academic integrity

- Create an academic integrity culture.
- Take it more seriously impose harsh penalties
- Chairs should be supportive of the code of academic conduct, and encourage faculty to bring forward cases where cheating in any form is suspected
- Continuously publicize the concern we all have for student, staff, and faculty honesty in their work.

Honor Code

- Having an honor code that faculty and students support.
- Honor code should be stated in an obvious way during registration.

Testing and Exams

- Have supervised test centers for exams and homework assignments.
- Make online courses have at least one proctored exam!
- More essay type tests which confirm depth of knowledge.
- Open book tests that require higher levels of critical thinking.
- Please issue TA's etc. I have over 200 students in my class! No way proper monitoring is possible.
- Yes, particularly for online courses in exams construct questions with two part responses where a correct answer on the first part allows the student to move the second part; otherwise, the response is incorrect.
- Enforce proctored exams for online courses.
- Check ID for students taking exams for face-to-face courses

Educational Efforts

- More emphasis on integrity and education about proper citation and plagiarism
- Professors should make greater efforts to make their courses "cheat proof."
- Education of the students and faculty on a regular basis, instituting seminars on the subject.
- Publicize disciplinary actions--without names
- Adopt more sophisticated examinations
- My suggestion is during orientation of the students give them examples of how students plagiarized both intentionally and unintentionally. Show how both are the same thing. Show it in different areas...English class, a science class, an art class, etc. so that the students see it from all perspectives.
- Early on educate the student on what it looks like when they cheat. I think a major problem is that students just do not know what it means.
- With an emphasis and the increase in online courses and degrees, we really need to address issues of academic integrity in online learning. I feel the resources and programs related to academic integrity for faculty, students, and instructional designers could and should be developed more here at FIU for online courses... and it needs to be addressed sooner than later. Turnitin is very helpful but we need more.
- The library tutorial (online) focuses far too much attention on plagiarism, as if avoiding plagiarism is the primary reason why a writer cites sources. Therefore, a student going through the tutorial will get the impression that everything, every fact, every statistic, must be cited.
- Give a workshop at beginning of every academic year, for instructors, professors, TA's and LA's, emphasizing key points.
- Require that the information be disseminated to the students in the classrooms, and administer a common quiz to all students regarding their understanding of academic integrity.
- Provide a clear, consistent message to all students from the beginning of their FIU experience to the end. Require an online tutorial that all FIU students (every level) must pass in their first semester at FIU.

Appendix B
Students- Qualitative Responses (examples)

Strategies toward combating academic dishonesty on campus

- Anonymous way of reporting cheating to a teacher.
- Publicize punishments of proven cases of cheating
- No discussion of test answers outside door of room where test is taking place
- Physically separate people more during exams.
- More teaching on proper citing and referencing practices
- Video observation of classes during exams
- More uniform policies university-wide
- Use of lockdown browser during the online exams.
- Fewer standardized tests
- More proctors during exams. This is when students cheat or take pictures of exams. I'm in grad school and just about every test I've taken so far I've been told is in circulation.
- Do not use test bank questions. Use fill in the blank questions. Also, assign a low percentage to quizzes and test assigned online.
- Designing a course that focus on proper work load, creating supportive learning environments, etc.

Specific suggestions to support academic integrity

- A required seminar as an incoming student, no matter the level.
- Actual test center as opposed to testing in lecture halls.
- Add turnitin to online courses that require essay and scholarly papers.
- All online exams should be proctored.
- Let the teachers block cell phone & internet reception in the room during exam.
- Peer counseling for academic counseling concerns.
- Increased assistance for professors with a class load of 100 or more students.
- Educate the students more often during first year. The professors need to play a big role on that to always remind the students about the integrity of the school. I can count on my fingers how many times a professor stands on that. Yes, it is listed on the syllabus but they need to repeat it all the times.
- Students should have to take an oath and sign it before starting their first class at Florida International University.
- I think that undergraduate students should have to participate in a seminar that clearly defines what plagiarism is and what happens if/when they cheat. They need to know what happens if they are caught and what the consequences are for the first/second/etc. offense. Most undergrads I've challenged with purchasing papers or plagiarism didn't know or feel what they did was wrong and became very upset when forced to face consequences.
- Have a website where tips can be sent to the dean office, and students need to know the difference between integrity and snitching.
- Promote the awareness and respect of others work and giving credit where due. Teach students to learn to appreciate what they can do with their own words and work and how that is more beneficial than stealing other people's work.

- No laptops allowed in class unless required by the course many times people are just looking at Facebook and watching football games and it distracts others.
- A well-enforced honor code, requiring integrity both in WORD and deed, may curb the current culture of cheating being fostered on campus. I would like to see the character of the student body improve dramatically.
- Clearer guidelines and implementation of an honor code.
- More communication to undergraduate students on the importance of academic integrity.
- Group grading! I think professor need to be more severe with students that are free riders. Peer evaluation should be use not at the end of the course but with every project due.
- Students should sign a contractual agreement for each class (or during first year program) outlining what is and is not cheating/plagiarism/academic misconduct
- Harsher sanctions against students who violate the rules.
- More verbal communication with students to assess their understanding on a subject
- Personally, I did not know what to do or who to turn to when I suspected a cheating student, I did what I could but it resulted in retaliation from both the student and the university. Very little support/assurance of safety when I did report it.
- More efficient methods to evaluate student performance without using tests that require memorization. Using more of critical thinking types of questions.
- Every student that enters FIU, should be exposed to a web site page which explain academic integrity and the consequences of academic dishonesty and have it signed by using their student number
- Glad you are doing this survey -- it is important.
- The policy is fine. The student mentality needs to change from "I need the grade/pass" to "I need to learn this".