

Report of the Academic Integrity Committee to the University Faculty Second and Final Report

A Climate of Academic Integrity

As was discussed in our initial report, the available evidence indicates that, in common with other North American universities, there is reason for serious concern about the number of instances of academic dishonesty within the student body at StFX. Underlying the Committee's specific recommendations to begin responding to this problem is our view that the University community should begin by attempting to develop a climate of academic integrity.

- **“What is Academic Integrity and Why Is It Important?** Higher education and society benefit when colleges and universities have standards of integrity that provide the foundation for a vibrant academic life, promote scientific progress, and prepare students for responsible citizenship. Many institutions, however, have neither defined academic integrity nor expressly committed to it. Others explain academic integrity merely by listing behaviors that are prohibited rather than by identifying values and behaviors to be promoted.

The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) defines academic integrity as a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. From these values flow principles of behavior that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action.

An academic community flourishes when its members are committed to the five fundamental values. Integrity is built upon continuous conversations about how these values are, or are not, embodied in institutional life. As these conversations connect with institutional mission statements and everyday policies and practices, a climate of integrity is sustained and nurtured. Vigorous academic integrity policies, with faculty and student support, promote the learning process and the pursuit of truth. This also helps create a stronger civic culture for society as a whole.” (The Center for Academic Integrity, 1999, Duke University, *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*, p.4)

How Does a University Community Develop a Strong Programme for Academic Integrity

[Adapted slightly from *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*, The Centre for Academic Integrity, Duke University, 1999, p.10.]

The call to promote academic integrity places responsibility upon everyone in the educational community to balance high standards with compassion and concerns. From

its study of the processes and practices of successful academic integrity programmes, the Centre for Academic Integrity has developed seven principles that are appropriate to every institution of higher education.

An academic institution should:

1. have clear academic integrity statements, policies, and procedures that are consistently implemented;
2. inform and educate the entire community regarding academic integrity policies and procedures;
3. promulgate and practice rigorously these policies and procedures from the top down, and provide support to those who uphold them;
4. have a clear, accessible, and equitable system to adjudicate suspected violations of policy;
5. develop programmes to promote academic integrity among all segments of the campus community—these programmes should go beyond repudiation of academic dishonesty to include discussions about the importance of academic integrity and its connection to broader ethical issues and concerns;
6. be alert to trends in higher education and technology affecting integrity on campus; and,
7. regularly assess the effectiveness of its policies and procedures and take steps to improve and rejuvenate them.

In its previous report to the University Faculty, the Committee identified what we viewed as the central issues relating to academic integrity. We also suggested at that time that the University adopt a Code of Academic Integrity, and we provided a brief summary of a proposed code. The complete version of the proposed Code is reproduced below. It has been adapted from a widely used code that was originally developed by the Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University and published in a 1999 publication of that body, *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*.

Codes of Academic Conduct

- “The Center for Academic Integrity’s research shows that campus norms and practices, such as effective honor codes, can make a significant difference in student behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs.” (Keohane, 1991, p.2)
- “In an attempt to instill a culture of ethical and professional behaviour, McGill’s engineering faculty has adopted a code of ethics called the ‘Blueprint.’ It is a short, concise document that declares adherence to a set of six values: academic integrity, academic excellence, respect for others, equal rights, fostering community through extracurricular activities, and respect for university property....[This code] was not in response to specific incidents of cheating, but rather to proactively foster a high standard of behaviour. In February 1998 the Blueprint was unveiled. Now it is on a plaque in all the engineering classrooms,

on posters, on admission documents, and is a pledge that new students have a choice of signing. It is even a question on the exam in Dr. Mucciardi's course [he teaches the ethics section in a first year course on professional practice], because 'nothing makes a student listen more than to tell them it will be on the exam,' he says.

Jeff Karp, one of the engineering students who helped draft the Blueprint, is convinced of its value. 'It is really irritating and frustrating to be doing your best, honestly, and see others cheating around you. Having a code, which you all adopt, rises the bar for all students,' says Mr. Karp.

Dr. McCabe's surveys show that adopting an honour code at a university is an effective strategy to reduce cheating. 'The real value of an honour code is that it lays out, in clear terms, what is expected of students and how they are to behave,' he says. 'When a college is silent on issues, the student gets the impression that the issues are not seen as being important.'" (Mullens, 2000, pp.27-28)

Proposed Code of Academic Conduct

An academic community flourishes when its members are committed to five fundamental values.

Honesty: An academic community of integrity advances the quest for truth and knowledge by requiring intellectual and personal honesty in learning, teaching, research, and service.

Honesty is the foundation of teaching, learning, research, and service, and it is the prerequisite for full realization of trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Campus policies should uniformly deplore cheating, lying, fraud, theft, and other dishonest forms of behaviour that jeopardize the rights and welfare of the community and diminish the worth of its degrees. Honesty begins with oneself and extends to others. In the quest for knowledge, students and faculty alike must be honest with themselves and with each other, whether in the classroom laboratory, or library, or in the playing field. Cultivating honesty lays the foundation for lifelong integrity, developing in each of us the courage and insight to make difficult choices and accept responsibility for actions and their consequences, event at personal cost.

Trust: An academic community of integrity fosters a climate of mutual trust, encourages the free exchange of ideas, and enables all to reach their highest potential.

People respond to consistent honesty with trust. Trust is also promoted by: members of faculty who set clear guidelines for assignments and for evaluating student work; students who prepare work that is honest and thoughtful; and, universities that set clear and consistent academic standards and that support honest and impartial research. Only with trust can we believe in the research of others and move forward with new

work. Only with trust can we collaborate with individuals sharing information and ideas without fear that our work will be stolen, our careers stunted, or our reputations diminished. Only with trust can our communities believe in the social value and meaning of an institution's scholarship and degrees.

Fairness: An academic community of integrity establishes clear standards, practices, and procedures and expects fairness in interactions of students, faculty, and administrators.

Fair and accurate evaluation is essential in the educational process. For students, important components of fairness are predictability, clear expectations, and a consistent and just response to dishonesty. Faculty members also have a right to expect fair treatment, not only from students but also from colleagues and members of the Administration. All members of the university community have a role in ensuring fairness, and a lapse by one of its members does not excuse misconduct by another. Rationalizations such as 'everyone does it' or 'the curve was too high' do not justify or excuse dishonesty.

Respect: An academic community of integrity recognizes the participatory nature of the learning process and honours and respects a wide range of opinions and ideas.

To be most rewarding, teaching and learning demand active engagement and mutual respect. Students and members of faculty must respect themselves and each other as individuals, not just as means to an end. They must also respect themselves and each other for extending their boundaries of knowledge, testing new skills, building upon success, and learning from failure. Students show respect by attending class, being on time, paying attention, listening to other points of view, being prepared, contributing to discussions, meeting academic deadlines, and performing to the best of their ability. Being rude, demeaning, or disruptive is the antithesis of respectful conduct. Members of faculty show respect by taking students' ideas seriously, providing full and honest feedback on their work, valuing their aspirations and goals, and recognizing them as individuals. All must show respect for the work of others by acknowledging their intellectual debts through proper identification of sources. Once again, the interdependence of the values that constitute academic integrity becomes apparent. Part of respecting people involves fair and honest treatment, and all of this supports an environment of trust.

Responsibility: An academic community of integrity upholds personal accountability and depends upon action in the face of wrong-doing.

Every member of an academic community—each student, faculty members, and administrator—is responsible for upholding the integrity of scholarship and research. Shared responsibility distributes the power to effect change, helps overcome apathy, and stimulates personal investment in upholding academic integrity standards. Being responsible means taking action against wrongdoing, despite peer pressure, fear, loyalty, or compassion. At a minimum, individuals should take responsible for their own honesty and should discourage and seek to prevent misconduct by others. This may be as simple

as covering one's own answers during a test or as difficult as reporting a friend for cheating, as required by some honour codes. Whatever the circumstances, members of an academic community must not tolerate or ignore dishonesty on the part of others.

General Strategies for Preventing Academic Dishonesty

[adapted from McGill]

1. In general, there is less cheating in institutions where students are clearly aware of the official policies relating to academic dishonesty. Any effort to bring such policies to the attention of students tends to result in a reduction in breaches of regulations regarding academic integrity.
2. Efforts to promote academic integrity among students are most effective if approached consistently across the University.
3. In universities that have been effective in reducing academic dishonesty, a common factor is that a broad range of faculty and other members of the university community mutually reinforce the message that the university cares about academic integrity, cheating and plagiarism, that measures are taken to prevent their occurrence, and that all students caught violating the Code of Conduct face appropriate consequences.
4. Each faculty member should draw students attention to the issue of academic integrity, including the University's regulations concerning academic offenses and the possible consequences for committing them.
 - "Cheating and plagiarism are less likely to occur if students believe that cheaters will face consequences. Such measures are effective directly, because they deter would-be dishonesty as well as indirectly, because they assure students that their peers will not resort to dishonesty, and thereby remove a commonly given reason for cheating and plagiarism."

Explaining to students what the various forms of academic dishonesty involve are important for two reasons: explanation removes ambiguity and reinforces the awareness that you and the University care about academic integrity.

Educating Students on Matters Relating to Academic Integrity

There is widespread agreement that education about academic dishonesty is a key element in reducing such behaviour; this appears to be the case for all forms of infringement of codes of academic integrity, but the relationship is particularly strong for offences involving the misuse of sources. Another reason for the Committee's emphasis on the central importance of education relates to our approach to disciplinary issues relating to alleged academic dishonesty: information on academic integrity issues and the university's policies with respect to the topic must be sufficiently widely disbursed and known that no student may reasonably argue ignorance.

Plagiarism

Detecting Plagiarism

1. Written Course Work: Ways of Detecting Plagiarism

There are a number of clues that may indicate that a student has plagiarized all or part of a paper:

- the writing varies in style and sophistication throughout the paper;
- the paper is written in a style inconsistent with the usual writing of the student;
- text font, margins, or page numbering is inconsistent throughout the paper;
- no recent references are cited; and,
- many references come from monographs or journals not available in our library.

1. **Simple searches Faculty members can do on Their Own Computers**

- A professor at Syracuse University suggests typing a suspiciously ‘content-heavy’ phrase from a student’s paper into the search engine Google. The number of hits is usually minimal because of the specific search words used.

2. **“Phrase Searching” on the Library Databases**

- Start with the Library full-text databases most likely to be used by a student in the course. Proquest (Research Library) is heavily used by students and is a good place to start. Use a phrase that contains a combination of words that would be likely to appear frequently.
- Use quotation marks to indicate the words should occur together.
- As an example, you might be suspicious that the following paragraph is plagiarized:
A good case could be made that Herder is the founder not only of modern philosophy of language but also of the modern philosophy of interpretation (“hermeneutics”) and translating and that he has many things to say on these subjects from which we may still learn today.

One has to decide what phrase would be best to try to locate. A search of Research Library for “philosophy of language”, for example, retrieves 149 articles while the “philosophy of interpretation” retrieves eight articles. However searching for “Herder is the founder” finds only one article—the correct one. [The paragraph is taken from an article by M.N. Forster entitled “Herder’s philosophy of language, interpretation, and Translation: Three fundamental principles” that appeared in the December 2002 issue of *The Review of Metaphysics*.]

- When phrase searching, be sure that the search is done on the **full-text** of the articles and not just on the citation and abstract.
- Although not usually necessary several phrases can be combined to improve accuracy. A search for “controversy over sustainability” **and** “protecting certain species” on Elsevier will find the article with the following paragraph.

Fisheries management tries to maximize (with constraints) some measure of ‘output’ from a fishery. Controversy over sustainability, protecting biological diversity, and protecting certain species is largely an issue of how society weights various constraint and decision variables. [From: Lackey, R.T. (1998). Fisheries management: Integrating societal preference, decision analysis, and ecological risk assessment. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 1, 329-235.]

3. Phrase Searching on the Internet

Phrase searching the Internet using Google is another avenue for checking for suspicious sections of a student paper.

- A “term paper” on the www.123Student.com website includes the following paragraph:
“A major problem in discussing terrorism is establishing a generally accepted definition. Terrorism can be described as the unlawful use of fear or force to achieve certain political, economical, or social aims...” Searching for the phrase “major problem in discussing terrorism” on Google retrieves three papers, all from student paper sites including two copies of one paper and another that includes the same sentence but varies in other content.
- Remember to use quotation marks to indicate that the search is for a phrase.
- When a phrase search on Google results in too many hits, scroll to the bottom of the first page of the results and choose “Search within results.” Then search for a second phrase within the paper to improve accuracy.

4. Plagiarism Detection Services and Software

There are also a number of plagiarism detection services and software problems available to aid in detecting papers that have been downloaded from the Internet and paper mill sites. There are a few free services, but most require a fee.

- PlagiServe: Users are required to register, but the service is free. Twelve hours after submitting a paper, a report is generated indicating if matching papers have been found.
- Eve: After searching the web for matches, a report is generated that indicates the percentage of the paper that is plagiarized and highlighting the plagiarized sections. Eve software is loaded locally on your computer. There is a \$20 US fee for Eve software.
- Turnitin.com: Turnitin.com maintains a large database of papers submitted from members and papers are compared to this database as well as searching the Internet. Turnitin licensing can be for individual faculty member, for Departments, or a university as a whole.

Cheating on Examinations and Tests

As indicated in the Committee’s earlier report, there is extensive and disturbing evidence about the extent of cheating on tests and examinations by North American university students, including our own students at StFX. A thesis done in 2002-2001 by an honours statistics student at this university, for example, found—with a sample of more than 1200 StFX students—that as many as 55.3% (or as few as 26.9%) of fourth-year students may have cheated on a test or examination during their academic career at StFX, with the upper figure rising to 63.5% for those who have attend the university for more than four years. More informal surveys of our students this year indicate that they are not surprised by these figures.

There is an extensive research literature on the factors related to cheating on tests and examinations. Among the factors that have been demonstrated to be predictive are the following:

- a competitive atmosphere among students;
- large class sizes;
- examinations written in rooms that are not appropriate;
- multiple choice and short answer types of examinations
- similar examinations given in successive years;
- Faculty members who don't attempt to control cheating;
- student perceptions that those who cheat aren't caught or, if they are, aren't punished; and,
- student believe that they are at a competitive disadvantage if they don't cheat, given the prevalence of academic dishonesty among the student body.

The Committee heard many comments about the conditions under which tests and examinations are currently written at StFX. Faculty members who, in particular, have come to the University more recently, commented on the apparent casualness—even laxness—of our approach to writing tests and examinations. Many people—both Faculty members and students—indicated that, in their view, this was an issue that needed to be addressed urgently. While it is possible that some of the following statements may be exaggerated, they collectively present a disturbing picture and suggest that there is a wide-spread sense that our procedures need to be reviewed and changed. The Committee has had several discussions with the Registrar who, like others in the university community, is concerned about present practices. Among the specific comments made by current StFX students (and by some Faculty members) with respect to the conditions under which tests and examinations are written at this university are the following:

- tests and examinations are often written in rooms that are entirely unsuitable—where, for example, the seating is such (e.g., tiered, round tables) that it is easy to see the papers of other students;
- similarly, examination rooms are often so crowded that the papers of other students are easily seen;
- even for those writing in the gymnasium, the seating arrangements are such that students writing the same examination are permitted to sit beside or in front of behind one another;
- there is no provision for students to be supervised when they go to the bathroom during an examination;
- two or more students are sometimes permitted to leave the room at the same time;
- some students are known to hide material outside the examination room that they consult when they leave for an ostensible bathroom break;
- while check of bathrooms may be made by Security for some examination sittings, this is not standard practice across the University;
- students are similarly known to consult others using cell phones when they are out of the examination/test room;

- there is often an insufficient number of invigilators during many examinations;
- if there is a head invigilator, Faculty members typically do not understand what the responsibilities of that individual might be;
- invigilators sometimes sit at the desk at the front of the room reading or marking examinations, seldom or even never circulating throughout the room;
- invigilators sometimes leave students alone in the test or examination room—sometimes for extended periods—during the writing of the tests;
- students are sometimes permitted to enter the examination room and begin writing very late (even after other students have left);
- IDs are seldom checked;
- students are often, permitted to bring coats, backpacks, and other possessions into the examination room and even to their seats;
- it is common for students to wear hats while writing exams—apparently notes are sometimes hidden in hat brims;
- Faculty members may not specify what may be brought into the examination room (e.g., calculators) or if they do, don't check to see whether the students are adhering to the restrictions;
- new types of electronic devices can hold enormous amounts of material, yet the University has not adopted any position on when—if ever—these may be brought into an examination or test room (some institutions—even schools) now provide students with calculators when required or scan a student's own device at the beginning of the examination to ensure that no banned material is present;
- students are not asked to sign a seating chart that would indicate where each person sat should there be a question of copying;
- if procedures exist for reacting to and reporting possible instances of cheating, they are unknown to some Faculty members;
- students are sometimes said to write tests in pencil, with the intention of asking for a reread after they have made corrections or added material to their script following its return to them by the Faculty member;

Specific Actions Proposed

One of the difficulties faced by the Committee on Academic Integrity faced was in attempting to come up with a mechanism to ensure—or at least to increase the probability—that at least some of the things that we are proposing might be put in place at StFX. Many universities have established a permanent Academic Integrity Committee, but we are not proposing that this be done at our University—at least not in the immediate future. In our view, the level of academic integrity will rise only when, as an academic community, we all accept not only that it is a goal worth striving for but that, as individuals, we will also do our part to promote it actively: administrators offering leadership as well as support to those more directly involved; faculty members and others on staff advocating for adherence to principles of academic honesty as well as following whatever rules and regulations that are eventually adopted by the University Senate, and

students striving both to learn what is implied by academic integrity and to satisfy its rigorous requirements.

In our view, education and learning in these matters are key—certainly of students, but also of other members of the university community too. But who is to take responsibility for this education? We believe that it is not the responsibility of any one narrow segment of the university. Our proposals assume that it is a challenge that many of us will accept. The Committee has already spoken to most of those whom we envision might become involved in this educational process. We have, by and large, been heartened by the level of agreement that our suggestions for active participation have met. Lacking any enforcement mechanism, the university will be dependent on the good will of those who see academic dishonesty as a serious problem and as an issue for which they bear some responsibility.

Recommendations

- I. It is recommended that the University join the Center for Academic Integrity, at Duke University. The purpose of this Center is to gather and share information about academic integrity, more specifically, “identifying and describing fundamental values of academic integrity and the sustaining practices that support those values on a variety of college and university campuses.” Additionally, the Center helps faculty members in different disciplines develop pedagogies that encourage adherence to these fundamental values” and showcases “successful approaches—policies, enforcement procedures, sanctions, research, curricular materials, and education/prevention programs.” [The annual cost of an institutional membership is \$350US, and this includes memberships for three individuals as well.]
- II. We recommend the adoption of a set of proposals whose aim is the education of students in matters relating to academic honesty.
 - A. It is recommended that the University adopt the Code of Academic Conduct that is described earlier in this document.
 - a. It has been proposed to the University Senate that a brief version of the Code of Academic Conduct be printed in the *Academic Calendar*.
 - b. The Committee has discussed with the organizing committee of the Xaverian Welcoming Ceremony the possibility of including the Code of Academic Conduct in some fashion in that ceremony for incoming students.
 - i. A Faculty member has proposed that students might sign a pledge of academic integrity at the ceremony.
 - ii. It has also been suggested to the Committee that consideration should be given to providing a possible venue might be for students (e.g., BEd) who would be unlikely to attend the ceremony mentioned above.

- c. The Committee has also discussed with the Dean of Students the possibility of including academic integrity among the topics discussed in the orientation week talk given by him to new students
- B. Academic Integrity Week: It has been increasingly common for universities to set aside a specific period during the academic year as an Academic Honesty (or Integrity) week. Dalhousie, for example, has such a week during which public debates involving students are held, workshops on proper citation practices are given, and an “Online Integrity Quiz” is made available to students.
- In her article “Cheating to Win”, Mullens (2000) describes the programme at the University of Manitoba. “When students feel they are under tremendous pressure, that is when they make bad decisions,’ says Lynn Smith, director of student advocacy at the University of Manitoba. For that reason, the University of Manitoba now stages ‘Academic Integrity Week’ during crunch time in November. During the week, Dr. Smith’s office hosts workshops, invites speakers and sets up display booths in the university centre to raise awareness of the dangers of cheating, promote the expectation of academic integrity, and gives moral support to students who may be feeling overwhelmed. ‘We have found its a great way to raise the awareness of the issues and reduce the temptation.’” (Mullens, 2000, p.27)
- a) The Students’ Union should be invited to participate in the organization of Academic Integrity Week.
 - b) During this week, the Faculty Development Committee might organize—perhaps in conjunction with the Students’ Union—a series of educational events for students and Faculty members.
- C. The Writing Centre at StFX is already familiar with, and heavily involved in promoting, certain aspects of academic integrity, particularly those related to identifying and avoiding plagiarism. We recommend that the Writing Centre continue this policy and do whatever else it can to foster adherence to the University’s policies relating to academic honesty.
- “Teaching students what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid plagiarism is an ongoing process here at the Writing Centre. We often recognize inappropriate paraphrasing or blatant plagiarism before papers are handed in. Fortunately, that gives us the opportunity to reiterate to students the serious consequences of plagiarism, and to suggest strategies they can adopt in order to appropriately integrate their source material. We always question students about the origin of content in their papers when it is not cited or when there is an abrupt shift in their writing style.” [Trudy MacCormack, Instructor in The Writing Centre, StFX]

- D. The Committee recommends that a website for matters relating to academic integrity, with two sections: one for students and one for Faculty members.
- Rita Campbell is volunteered to assist in establishing and maintaining these website.
 - The Committee recommends that a Faculty member—perhaps under the auspices of the Faculty Development Committee—work with her in developing content relating to academic integrity concerns useful to Faculty members.
3. We recommend that a number of programmes be established to educate and assist Faculty members in matters dealing with academic dishonesty.
- B. More specifically, we suggest that a series of workshops (or perhaps brown-bag lunch discussions) be organized by the Faculty Development Committee for members of Faculty dealing with the new policies and procedures with respect to Academic Integrity.
- a. One workshop might include topics such as the following:
 - The Code of Academic Conduct
 - The Nature and Types of Academic Dishonesty
 - The University's Regulations on Academic Dishonesty
 - b. Other workshops could include such topics as:
 - Procedures for Examinations and Tests [Office of the Registrar]
 - How to Reduce Plagiarism: Design of Assignments [with the participation of the Writing Centre]
 - Detecting Plagiarism [Library staff; it has been suggested that one of the members of the Library staff at Dalhousie who is involved in a similar programme there might be invited to present a workshop for our Faculty])
 - Ways of Designing Exams, Assignments, and Labs so that the Probability of Cheating is Reduced
 - c. A workshop might also be organized by the first chair of the proposed Senate Committee on Academic Discipline for its members, the Academic Discipline Officers, and for the members of the Joint Committee on Studies on such matters as the standard of proof necessary for finding a student guilty of academic dishonesty (assuming that some version of the proposal currently being considered by the University Senate is adopted). A member of the faculty of the Dalhousie Law School with extensive experience in this field has indicated his willingness to be a part of such a workshop. Mr. Robert Kitchen has also offered to meet with the relevant groups to discuss the requirements of fair hearings in conducting university hearings.
 - d. We would recommend that Departments that have mentoring procedures for new Faculty members consider include a discussion of issues related to academic honesty (e.g., university regulations, design of tests, assignments, labs).

- e. We would also recommend that the Faculty Development Committee include this topic in their session(s) with new Faculty members in the autumn.
- B. We also recommend that a website be established for Faculty members (parallel to that for students) to inform them on topics such as ways of detecting plagiarism using the computer and on ways of designing exams, assignments, and labs so that the probability of cheating is reduced.
- Rita Campbell is volunteered to assist in establishing and maintaining these website.
 - The Committee recommends that a Faculty member—perhaps under the auspices of the Faculty Development Committee—work with her in developing content relating to academic integrity concerns useful to Faculty members.
4. We recommend that the Registrar carry out an in-depth review of our current procedures for tests and procedures and that she develop a proposal for revising them in time for the examination period next Christmas. Based on the comments made to the Committee and by events reported in the literature at other institutions, we suggest in particular that she examine such issues as the following.
- Which rooms are appropriate for the writing of tests and examinations?
 - What is the maximum percentage of seats that should be occupied during a test or examination (this might vary from room to room)?
 - Should more examinations be written in rooms such as the gymnasium where multiple examinations may be written simultaneously?
 - Should more such rooms be set aside for this purpose during the major examination periods?
 - What type of seating plan should be in place for rooms where multiple examinations are written?
 - How many invigilators/proctors should be present during an examination?
 - What should be the duties of the head invigilator/proctor?
 - Should the head invigilator/proctor be someone other than an individual whose students are writing an examination during that time period?
 - How would the head invigilator/proctor and other invigilators/proctors be made aware of the duties and responsibilities of the head invigilator/proctor?
 - What are the specific duties of other invigilators/proctors?
 - What are students permitted to bring into the test or examination room and what is not permitted (e.g., hats, coats, books, notes, cell phones, other electronic devices)?
 - Are bathroom visits to be permitted? If so, how are they to be supervised? Should both male and female invigilators/proctors be

- assigned to rooms where multiple examinations are written simultaneously?
- Should picture-IDs be exhibited by students and checked?
 - Should students be required to sign a seating plan?
 - Should students be permitted to write their examinations in pencils?
 - Should there be explicit rules about when students may enter or leave the examination room to begin or cease writing (e.g., thirty minutes after the beginning of the test or examination)?
 - Might it be appropriate for the rules and regulations relevant to the student be printed on the back of the examination booklet?
5. With respect to tests and examinations as well, it is the Committee recommendation that the following statement be printed at the top of every test and examination and that it be read aloud by the instructor or invigilator at the beginning of the examination: “Students are reminded that cheating in any test or examination is considered a serious offence that could lead to expulsion from the University. During an examination or test, students are not permitted to have in their possession any unauthorized material.”
6. Similarly, we would recommend that the instructor indicate at the top of the test or examination paper the specific types of materials (e.g., books, calculator) that students may bring into the examination room.
7. The Committee also recommends that all course descriptions include the following statement [or such alternate wording as may be appropriate after the University Senate has completed its discussion of the proposed “Academic Dishonesty: Definitions and Regulations” section of the *Academic Calendar*: “St. Francis Xavier University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequence of such academic offenses as plagiarism, cheating, tampering, and falsification under Section 3.9 of the *Academic Calendar*.”

References

- Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University. The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (www.academicintegrity.org).
- Hendrickson, J. R. (1957). The research paper. New York: Henry Holt.
- Keohane, N.O. (1999). Preface to The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. Durham, NC: The Centre for Academic Integrity, Duke University.
- McCabe, D.L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence 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, 433-445, 658. [pages may not be correct]

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28, 28-33.

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L.K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 379-396.

Mullens, A. (2000). Cheating to win. *University Affairs*, 22-28.

Naczk, K. (2001). The Occurrence of examination cheating at St. Francis Xavier University. A thesis presented to the Faculty of the Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement of the BSc Honours Degree. Supervised by Dr. Lehana Thabane. [degree awarded April 2001]

Recommendations Still to be Discussed

1. Should we recommend purchasing some form of computerized detection system for plagiarism?
2. Consider purchasing some form of detection system for cheating on multiple-choice examinations.