5.1: Report on Academic Integrity

Item for: Discussion/Approval

Forwarded by: Student Committee Working Group on Academic Integrity

At the February 11, 2009 Senate meeting, it was suggested that consideration be given to conducting an independent review of the University’s education awareness programs relating to academic integrity with a view to determining their effectiveness and making recommendations for change, if appropriate. It was noted that more needs to be done to educate students on academic integrity matters. The Student Committee will consider the possibility of establishing an independent review of the University’s academic integrity education programs.

At its October 28, 2009 meeting the Student Committee approved the creation a Working Group on Academic Integrity to oversee the independent academic integrity review and to review the reviewer's report. In May 2010, an external consultant was hired to conduct the initial review of academic integrity initiatives on campus. The consultant's final report was submitted on October 15, 2010 (following revisions she made to her earlier submission).

Following the Undergraduate Program Review process, the external reviewer's report was reviewed by the Academic Integrity Officer, the Vice-Provost, Students and International, and the University Secretary, each of whom are charged, in one way or another through their respective portfolios, with specific academic integrity matters. The external reviewer's report together with the response from this group was provided to the Working Group. The Working Group reviewed this documentation and submitted its final report on February 22, 2011.

Next Steps:
- The Student Committee will review each recommendation and determine which ones to keep, revise or remove. Some recommendations may fall outside the purview of Senate, in which case the Student Committee should identify the appropriate office to which to send them.
- The report provided to Senate will consist of a summary of the process, an executive summary of the documents reviewed by the Student Committee, and the recommendations as approved by the Student Committee. For the complete reports, members will be directed to the website.

Attached, please find:
- The external reviewer’s report, with comments from Ms. Istl, Dr. Smith and Ms. Wintermute included using “track changes”
- The final report from the Working Group on Academic Integrity.
External reviewer’s report, with comments from Ms. Istl, Dr. Smith and Ms. Wintermute included using “track changes”

To: Student Committee Subcommittee on Academic Integrity
From: Danielle Istl, Clayton Smith, Renée Wintermute

Response to External Reviewer’s Report

The attached document contains the external reviewer’s report with comments from the Academic Integrity Officer, the Vice-Provost, Students and International, and the University Secretary, each of whom are charged, in one way or another, through their respective portfolios, with specific academic integrity matters.

Our comments focus on the final recommendations made and therefore start on page 43 of this report. As a preface, while the three of us agree that the recommendations are, by and large, helpful, sound and insightful, there are several instances where the comments and observations made leading up to the recommendations are based on a misunderstanding of the feedback provided, particularly as relates to the judicial process and the roles of the separate offices involved in it. Luckily, these misunderstandings do not negatively impact the recommendations due to the careful way in which they were worded by the external reviewer. If you have any questions about the content and statements made, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Academic Integrity Review

Julia Christensen Hughes
7/24/2010

(Resubmitted October 15, 2010 with minor amendments)
Dr. Julia Christensen Hughes is Dean of the College of Management and Economics at the University of Guelph, where she has been on faculty since 1987. Prior to her current role, she was President of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) and spent ten years as Director of Teaching Support Services. In 2002/2003 she conducted a national study on academic integrity, in collaboration with Don McCabe from Rutgers University. Her numerous conference presentations, faculty workshops, and two articles published in the Canadian Journal of Higher Education contributed to increased attention being given to academic integrity at universities across the country. In 2007, Julia and Don were presented with the Sheffield Award by the Canadian Society for Studies in Education, which recognizes the research article in the Canadian Journal of Higher Education deemed by the editors to be the best of the preceding year.
Introduction

This review was commissioned by Dr. Clayton Smith, Vice-Provost Students and Registrar on behalf of the “Working Group on Academic Integrity Review.” The objective of the review was to:

*Undertake a comprehensive review of the University of Windsor’s academic integrity programs with a view to determining their effectiveness and making recommendations for change if appropriate.*

Several distinct areas were identified as being seminal to this task, including:

1. Policies and procedures, including transparency and accountability
2. Organizational Structure, including positions and level
3. Awareness and Education

The review was proposed in part because it has been several years since the University of Windsor first established its Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and hired an Academic Integrity Officer to head up its operations. In addition, changes to the University’s academic integrity bylaw (Bylaw 31) were recently enacted, following an eight year review. Questions concerning the clarity and effectiveness of these changes and their implications for the role of the AIO have surfaced. Finally, there appears to be concern in some quarters of the University that international students may be being disproportionately charged with academic integrity violations.

In completing this review, data were gathered from a number of sources including:

- The draft strategic plan for the University of Windsor (Thinking Forward... Taking Action, 2010)
- Bylaw 31: Student Affairs and Integrity (Adopted 2 Dec 69, amended 10 Jan 2008)
- Backgrounder on New Bylaw 31, March 16, 2010
- Flow chart for Bylaw 31
- Senate Policy E3: Rules of Conduct for Examinations
In addition, interviews and discussions were held with a number of individuals and groups on May 5 and 6, 2010, including senior administrators; deans, associate deans, and heads; faculty; members of the Judicial Panel and Discipline Appeal Committee; personnel associated with the Academic Integrity Office, Registrarial Services, the University Secretariat, International Programs, Writing Services, and ESL support; Academic Advocates and Legal Aid representatives; and students. Several individuals emailed me additional information following my visit and in response to a draft report.

While I have made every effort to be as thorough in my review and analysis as possible, I recognize that limitations to my perspective necessarily exist. As such, my conclusions are tentative and presented as recommendations for consideration. A summary of the recommendations is included in Appendix 1.
Overall Impression

The University of Windsor has made great strides in its efforts towards academic integrity and should be proud of its accomplishments to date. Opportunities for enhancing these efforts exist in a number of areas as outlined in this report. I wish the University and its members every success in prioritizing opportunities for improvement and implementing the preferred recommendations.

-----

Under the leadership of Dr. Clayton Smith, the University of Windsor has invested considerable resources and energy in bringing increased attention to the issue of academic misconduct amongst faculty and students; putting in place associated Bylaws and processes; dealing with such cases when they do arise; and gathering, analyzing and sharing related information to the University community in a transparent manner. The University is to be commended for its efforts.

Not surprisingly, the University of Windsor is recognized as a leader in academic integrity related initiatives within the Canadian higher education community and Academic Integrity Officer, Danielle Istl, is widely respected in her role. Never the less, opportunities for enhancing the University’s approach to academic misconduct do exist. These opportunities in general include:

- Clarifying and enhancing the role of faculty and the associate deans with respect to Bylaw 31
- Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of processes associated with Bylaw 31
- Achieving a better balance between prosecution and education
- Providing increased education and resources in support of academic integrity
- Improving examination invigilation and security
- Establishing an Academic Integrity Advisory Council, consisting of key stakeholders, to prioritize issues, coordinate implementation, and assess progress
The analysis that follows is divided into five sections beginning with an overview of the prevalence of academic misconduct at the University of Windsor. Next is a section on international students. Following, are three sections mirroring the three primary areas of interest listed above: Policies and Procedures, Organizational Structure, and Awareness and Education. Within each section, data are summarized, key issues are identified and specific recommendations are made.
I. Prevalence of Academic Misconduct

According to the 2006 Student and Faculty Academic Integrity Assessment Report (Voakes, 2006), over half (56.2%) of University of Windsor faculty agree or strongly agree that cheating is a serious problem at the University (p. 19). During the interviews, however, academic administrators strongly voiced the opinion that Windsor students “are no worse than students at other universities.” Indeed, rates of academic misconduct reported by Windsor students appear to be more or less consistent with other Ontario universities, with students admitting to having participated in a range of questionable behaviours.

In the 2006 study, 36% of Windsor students reported having collaborated with others when asked for individual work, 33% of students reported having paraphrased a few sentences of material without citation, and 17% reported having received substantial assistance on an assignment from another person when such assistance was not permitted (p. 15). In addition, 55% of students reported being sure they had observed another student cheating during a test or exam (p. 10).

As part of the current review, when asked about types of academic misconduct they had witnessed, faculty and administrators expressed concern with the growing “complexity of student schemes” including the fabrication of university transcripts and degrees and the theft of exams from faculty offices. Challenges particular to international students were also cited, such as students being coerced into helping other students from the same ethnic group cheat. The suggestion was also made that some faculty need to rethink what they consider cheating. For example, some questioned the reasonableness of students being charged with academic misconduct for getting help on take home exams or in sharing exam questions with one another, when the same exam is being used over multiple days and sections or from year to year. To help avoid such cases, it was suggested that many faculty need to improve their approach to assessment, which might be facilitated through greater support and development opportunities.
Despite these self-reported rates and concerns, only approximately 1% of University of Windsor students are charged with academic misconduct each year (Istl, 2009). This suggests that a substantial portion of academic misconduct cases are either going undetected and/or that a substantial number of University of Windsor faculty or administrators are choosing not to proceed with charges against their students.

The 2006 University of Windsor study found that 51% of faculty respondents reported having ignored a suspected case of cheating, with lack of evidence being the most frequently cited reason for having done so. For those who did report a case (70% of faculty surveyed indicated they had done so), less than half (47.9%) indicated they were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the results. Suggesting a potential area for improvement, faculty satisfaction is reportedly higher elsewhere in the country, with 65% of faculty suggesting they were either very or somewhat satisfied in Christensen Hughes and McCabe’s (2006b) national study on student cheating.

In assessing the effectiveness and transparency of the University of Windsor’s academic misconduct policies, it would be helpful to know if the student and faculty behaviours and perceptions reported in the 2006 study have changed over the past several years.

**Recommendation #1a: The 2006 academic integrity survey should be repeated in a year or so (as is planned), to ascertain if changes in reported student and faculty behaviours and perceptions have occurred.**

According to the fifth annual *Comprehensive Student Discipline Report, 2008/2009* (Istl, 2009), the University of Windsor investigated 159 discipline complaints last year, 152 of which were academic and 7 of which were non-academic (p. 8). Of these, students were found responsible in 148 cases. For the academic cases, the offences ranged from plagiarism in take home exams to exam cheating, unauthorized collaboration, multiple offences, and academic forgery or fraud. Ten cases involved repeat offenders (the highest recidivism rate seen in five years) (p. 11). For the non-academic cases four were against persons and three were against property (p. 8).
In comparison with the previous year, the report states that the University “experienced a 15% decrease in academic misconduct complaints overall but a significant increase in the number of academic complaints that were referred to Judicial Panels” (p. 3). Sixteen judicial panels processed almost 59% more cases with 44% of cases – versus 23% - reaching judicial panels (p. 3). In previous years, over 77% of cases were resolved informally (the students admitted wrongdoing), in comparison to just 56% of cases in 2008/2009 (p. 3). That said, 73% of cases that reached Judicial Panels in 2008/2009 were resolved before a formal hearing (p. 3).

This increased use of Judicial Panels led some participants to conclude that the University’s approach for dealing with academic misconduct has “become far too legalistic and antagonistic” with insufficient focus on education and prevention, and the involvement of faculty and administrators (chairs/heads, associate deans) at the local level. Specific recommendations pertaining to this issue are identified in various sections of this report.

In terms of sanctions, 37% of students were suspended (an increase from 20% the year prior), 27% received an admonition, 27% were censured, 1% were expelled, and less than 1% were dismissed (p. 10). Student demographics show that the majority of cases involved males (63%) and domestic students (69%) (p. 11).

All of the above data excludes students from the Faculty of Law, which has its own processes and policies for dealing with cases of academic misconduct. The Faculty of Law reported just one incident in 2008/09 (p. 5). Either the Faculty of Law has implemented effective processes (such as its use of external invigilators) that have successfully deterred cheating and created a culture of integrity, or far fewer cases are being detected and/or reported. Further investigation is needed (perhaps as part of the academic survey) in order to determine which is the case. Where “best practices” exist, it is important that these be shared across the institution. Deans and Associate Deans who were interviewed as part of this review commented on how much they appreciated the opportunity to get together to discuss academic misconduct issues and to learn from one another. More of this type of activity is recommended.
Recommendation #1b: The results of the academic integrity survey should be analyzed by faculty/department in order to more clearly identify issues and “best practices” across the institution.

Recommendation #1c: More focus is needed on education and prevention and the sharing of ideas and best practices across the institution. The active involvement of faculty and associate deans/heads is essential in this regard.

Recommendation #1d: An annual meeting should be held that brings together deans and associate deans to review academic integrity reports and policies, discuss concerns and successes, and to share ideas and practices for fostering local cultures that support academic integrity.
II. International Students

According to the University’s draft strategic plan (Thinking Forward...Taking Action, p. 20), “the University of Windsor has one of the most internationalized student bodies in Canada” and is committed to providing “international students with the very best experience that the University of Windsor has to offer.” Further, promoting “international engagement through student recruitment...” (p. 20) is one of five strategic priorities for the institution.

Currently, approximately 11% (1,600) of the University of Windsor’s students are international (Istl, 2009, p. 12). The University has prioritized the recruitment of international students in order to provide an enriching educational environment. International students have also become increasingly essential in terms of maintaining operating revenues and offsetting declines in domestic enrolments.

According to the 2008/2009 Comprehensive Discipline Report 2008/2009 (Istl, 2009), summarized in the preceding section, of the 159 cases, 109 pertained to domestic students (an average of 36 cases representing .34% of the domestic student population per semester) and 50 pertained to international students (an average of 17 cases and representing 1.2% of the international student population per semester) (p. 12). While not being tracked, it was suggested by some participants that domestic student cases appear to also be disproportionately represented by students of colour.

In explanation of these results, several participants suggested that some faculty may be over zealously pursuing charges against visible minority students. While it is beyond the scope of this report to comment on the extent to which this may be the case, ensuring that associate deans/heads are well trained in coaching their faculty and assessing the merits of potential academic misconduct cases, including distinguishing between the need for an educational response (i.e., a “teachable moment”) and a punitive response, should help address this issue. Ensuring a diverse mix of people (students and faculty) continue to be well-represented on Judicial Panels may also be important in terms of fostering perceptions of procedural equity.
Others suggested that some international students, while having gained admittance on the basis of acceptable TOEFL scores, may in fact have poorly developed English literacy skills, bringing into question the integrity of the TOEFL process. Further, the authenticity of the credentials presented by some students was strongly called into question by one participant, who cited the existence of sophisticated operations that produce high quality, counterfeit transcripts and diplomas. Students who have been admitted on the basis of weak or false credentials will clearly face many academic challenges. In addition, plagiarism is considered to be a largely Western concept, which is not necessarily embraced by other cultures. International students who have successfully navigated their way through their own country’s educational systems, by developing the ability to reiterate what they have read or been told, can find themselves feeling somewhat alienated by Western expectations.

At the University of Windsor, several forms of support are available to international students. Currently, international students have a pre-departure meeting and a two day orientation when they arrive in Canada, including a 45 minute presentation at which the AIO reviews the institution’s academic integrity policies, presents actual cases, and brings in seasoned international students to talk about their experiences with academic misconduct. While these efforts are to be applauded (particularly the use of actual cases and student testimonials in which cultural differences are raised and the consequences of academic misconduct are made clear), fall orientation may not be the right time to introduce students to this topic. Many international students arrive late on campus due to visa issues, etc. and miss these orientation/presentation sessions. Further, the orientation is not mandatory which means that students may opt to not attend.

It was suggested by several participants that an educational program that commences a month or so after the students have arrived and started classes may be more effective. Given that it is unlikely that such a session could be made mandatory, considerable effort will need to be expended in encouraging students to attend. A series of orientation sessions held over the course of the students’ first year that include both social and educational components, may prove to be the most effective option. While such an initiative will require some additional resources, given the University of Windsor’s strategic focus on internationalism, such an investment would be consistent with this direction and potentially allow
the University to claim that it offers, the “most extensive orientation program for international students in the country”.

Writing consultants are also available to international students to help them review and improve previously graded work. Observations by those associated with this work suggest that there is a considerable lack of consistency across the institution in terms of the feedback and grades students receive, with some students receiving top grades for work that is barely comprehensible. Further, while some faculty are vigilant about following up on suspicions of plagiarism, others are not. It was suggested that this lack of consistency is confusing to students and calls into question the faculty’s commitment to institutional policies. Further, participants questioned whether faculty and TAs have the training they need to effectively design and assess writing assignments. They also suggested that much more needs to be done to convince faculty that they should report plagiarism when it does occur.

A “Foundations of Academic Writing” course, taken by approximately 2,400 students, is intended to further help students learn about plagiarism policies and to develop their English writing skills. Incidents of plagiarism are reportedly relatively common amongst the international students in this course, with 30 to 40 students per semester submitting work “cut and pasted” from peer reviewed sources. Students have even been known to plagiarize work of a personal nature, such as when asked to write a paragraph on their own life experience.

The suggestion was made by several participants that all English as a Second Language (ESL) students should be screened once they arrive at the University (perhaps as part of the Foundations of Academic Writing course and other similar courses), to re-test their English proficiency in order to stream them into appropriate course sections and provide them with needed supports. This practice is already in place in the Odette School of Business where all new undergraduate international students are required to sit for an English placement test.

Finally there is an International Student Centre that is available to help students with a variety of issues. Participants suggested that it would be helpful if more faculty encouraged their students to make use of this facility and its services. Ensuring that faculty are well aware of the Centre and its mandate would be an essential component of such a recommendation.
Recommendation #2a: Ensure associate deans/heads are well trained in coaching their faculty and assessing the merits of potential academic misconduct cases, including distinguishing between the need for an educational response (i.e., a “teachable moment”) and a punitive response.

Recommendation #2b: Endeavour to ensure diverse representation (students and faculty) on all Judicial Panels.

Recommendation #2c: Test all ESL students for English proficiency upon arrival at the University of Windsor (potentially as part of existing courses such as the Foundations of Academic Writing course). Stream students into programs and course sections as appropriate.

Recommendation #2d: Institute a year-long orientation program for international students, in collaboration with the International Student Centre that combines both academic and social elements. Include academic integrity as one of the topics covered, approximately one month after the semester has begun.

Recommendation #2e: Provide faculty at the beginning of each year with a list of resources available to all students (something that is easily posted to a bulletin board). In keeping with the University’s strategic directions, have Deans or Associate Deans/Heads suggest to their faculty that they make a point of explicitly welcoming their international students and encourage them to engage with the orientation program and other supports that are available to them.

Further recommendations pertaining to international students are embedded within the sections that follow.

III. Policies and Procedures: Transparency and Accountability

Amended Bylaw 31 (Student Affairs and Integrity) was introduced in September 2009 after being approved by Senate in November 2007, and following 8 years of comprehensive review and revision.

In terms of its latest revision, a key point of institutional debate was how centralized or decentralized to make the new process and two proposals (one
centralized and one decentralized) were generated and presented to Senate as outlined in Backgrounder on New Bylaw 31 (March 16, 2010). The benefits of each model were elaborated, with faculty authority, accountability and informality identified as benefits of the decentralized model. Consistency, standardization, resource efficiency, and reducing the workload of associate deans were identified as benefits of a more centralized approach. Ultimately (and by a narrow vote), the centralized model won out.

When the amended Bylaw was formally adopted in September 2009 one key point of difference with past practice was therefore that the “Complainant” role, originally the responsibility of the associate deans, was to be played by the AIO. Another change introduced mediation as an option as an alternative to Judicial Review.

While some concerns have been voiced concerning ByLaw 31, the Vice-Provost has recommended keeping it in place for one or two years before any further changes are contemplated.

Concerns around Bylaw 31 raised during this review pertained primarily to:

- The existence of conflicting information and hence confusion about the process
- Lack of clarity around the role of the faculty and associate deans
- A general sense that the process is too bureaucratic, legalistic, antagonistic and complicated
- Concern with the amount of time to resolution
- Concern with the mediation process

Of note, there appears to be some degree of inconsistency between information generated from the AIO and the Office of the University Secretariat. This is problematic, as both offices apparently share responsibility for implementing Bylaw 31. According to the AIO website, “Judicial Affairs involves the processing of student disciplinary complaints – academic or non-academic – through the Office of the University Secretariat and the Academic Integrity Office” (see http://www.uwindsor.ca/academicintegrity/judicial-affairs-information).

For example, according to the on-line student document, FAQ if complaint filed against you, and the FAQ re Complaint Process, Bylaw 31 requires faculty who
suspect academic misconduct to report it. According to the Comprehensive Student Discipline Report (Istl, 2009), however, which explicitly cites the expectations of amended Bylaw 31, a “professor may choose to deal with a minor infraction by a student on his/her own and only file a formal complaint in the event of a second known offence by the student in the course” (p. 11).

While inconsistent with the documents mentioned above, the latter is arguably a reasonable approach, as it is consistent with the principle of faculty discretion and reinforces the importance of education or the “teachable moment”. As one faculty member stated, “I need to have the ability to say ‘that was not a wise choice’ and keep a record of the situation and decision.”

Research suggests that a large percentage of faculty deal with such issues on their own regardless of formal policy (Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006a; Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006b). Allowing some ability in this regard alongside sound record keeping can be helpful in gaining a more accurate perspective of the number and types of cases dealt with on an annual basis.

Such an approach, however, can present challenges that have to be carefully managed. For example, faculty hold differences of opinion as to what constitutes a “minor” infraction and this should be clarified. It is also unclear as to whether or not faculty can impose a penalty in such an event (e.g., impose a grade reduction or require the student to do the work again). As previously suggested, it is also essential to have a process for tracking such cases, so that there is a record of first offences of this nature. Doing any of this, however, would be inconsistent with Bylaw 31, as it is currently written. A compromise for consideration is allowing faculty to impose a “warning” in clearly defined minor cases, with the potential to require the student to do the work again as well as complete an on-line educational module on academic integrity.

**Recommendation 3a: Clarify the circumstances (if any) under which faculty may deal with minor infractions on their own as well as the limits of their ability to impose sanctions. Given consideration to amending Bylaw 31 to allow faculty the ability to impose a “warning” which may require the student to do the work again and/or complete an on-line educational module on academic integrity.**
**Recommendation 3b:** Extend the current mechanism for tracking students who receive sanctions, maintained by the Senate Secretariat, to include those imposed by faculty, consistent with 3a above.

There is also some confusion pertaining to the reporting process and some inconsistencies that warrant rethinking. This is supported by the March 9, 2010 Report from the Academic Advocate Office (Kishnani, 2010, pp. 8-9) which suggests:

> there are communication barriers that exist between professors and students and between associate deans and professors about policies and procedures under Senate By-laws 31 and 51... There is a lack of understanding on the application of the By-laws in the classroom and in relation to academic integrity matters.

According to the FAQ re Complaint Process document produced through the AIO, faculty who suspect misconduct are to complete Form 2a in the case of academic misconduct or Form 1 in the case of non-academic misconduct, such as in the case where a student is disruptive to the classroom environment (see Bylaw 31 Forms). They are also directed that once they have completed the form they are to “give it to your department head for review and signing (if you are in a departmentalized Faculty). Then send it and all attachments directly to the Senate Office.” At this time, “the Judicial Affairs & Hearings Officer will open a file, then redirect the file to (the) Associate Dean, who will invite the student to a meeting to discuss the allegation”.

Form 2a reinforces this perspective as it requires the signature of the faculty member and the AAU Head, and states that “This report, along with all relevant documentation and evidence in support of the complaint, is to be submitted to the Senate Secretariat, which shall forward the report to the Associate Dean of the Faculty in which the alleged misconduct occurred. The Associate Dean may refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Officer who shall conduct an investigation” (Bylaw 31 JA Forms – Form 2A).
In contrast to this direction, according to Bylaw 31 (3.2.1), instructors are told to “forward all appropriate documentation, including a signed report, to the Associate Dean of the Faculty in which the alleged misconduct occurred...After reviewing the documentation and having met with the student, the Associate Dean shall determine whether to forward the matter, including all relevant documentation and evidence, to the Academic Integrity Officer, through the Office of the Senate Secretariat, who shall conduct an investigation” (p. 4).

In short, faculty are supposed to be consulting with their associate deans, but are not receiving clear and consistent direction in this regard. It is important that the FAQ information available through the AIO and Form 2A available through the Senate Office be made consistent with Bylaw 31 (3.2.1) and that the AIO, when asked for direction, explains to faculty that in most instances they are to consult with their associate deans as a first step. Requiring the associate dean’s signature on Form 2a would be one simple way of ensuring that this happens.

Furthermore, it was suggested by interview participants that even once filed, rather than cases being directed to the associate deans (as required by Bylaw 31, 3.2.1), cases may be going directly to the AIO for investigation instead. The fact that this is occurring appears to be a source of conflict between the AIO and the Senate Secretariat. One explanation for this may be found in Bylaw 31 article 3.1.1 which states that “any member of the University community who believes a student has committed an act of misconduct may submit a written report to the Senate Secretariat...and [the report] shall be forwarded by the Senate Secretariat to the Academic Integrity Officer who shall conduct an investigation” (p. 3).

Furthermore, JA-Form 1 which accompanies 3.1.1 includes “faculty member” as an option for the person reporting the misconduct and also states that “the instructor may [emphasis added] follow the informal process outlined in 3.2.1” but does not recommend that they do so (Bylaw 31 JA Forms – Form 1).

In this way, Bylaw 31 essentially gives faculty an option of either working through their associate dean or through the AIO instead.

Where faculty have followed the directions in the FAQ and have filed directly with the Senate Secretariat, rather than involving their associate dean, the AIO may be
assuming that 3.1.1 is the relevant process. In such cases, she is only required to involve the associate dean once she has completed her investigation.

Without question, this approach needs to be challenged and wherever possible, 3.2.1 should be followed. The associate deans need to be fully aware of and engaged with the number and types of cases of academic misconduct occurring within their academic jurisdictions. This is important in terms of generating awareness about factors that may be contributing to academic misconduct, such as poorly designed assignments, the use of old exams, or issues with invigilation or security. Having first-hand knowledge of this information appropriately places responsibility for resolving the underlying issues in the hands of the associate deans. Academic misconduct policies are needed that not only serve as a deterrent and source of education for students, but also help to identify underlying issues and aid in their resolution. Presumably, only in rare circumstances, where there is a disagreement between a faculty member and the associate dean as to whether or not to proceed with a case, should faculty be using the option of 3.1.1 for academic misconduct cases.

In conversations with the associate deans, concern was expressed that given current practice, they no longer feel connected with the complaints originating in their own faculties and often only find out about cases once they have been investigated and reported by the AIO. According to one Associate Dean, “I have lost something as Associate Dean, I no longer know how many cases are being processed.”

Having the associate deans make the initial judgement as to whether or not there is sufficient evidence to proceed with a complaint should also help to reduce the workload of the AIO and the time to resolution. Effectively investigating 150 to 200 cases or more per year is clearly very time-consuming (if not impossible) for one person. That said, there are differences of opinion as to whether the amount of time to resolution is actually increasing or decreasing as a result of the changes to Bylaw 31, with ballpark estimates for contested cases remaining in the six to 12 month range.

In the interviews participants expressed concern with the amount of time cases have been taking, citing student inability to register for needed courses and
delays in graduation. The Report from the Academic Advocate Office (Kishnani, 2010, p. 9), lists “the length of time to conduct and resolve matters through hearings and judicial panels” as one of three primary non-compliance concerns of the office.

According to the FAQ document for faculty, faculty are to assign a grade of “incomplete” pending the outcome of the complaint process. Concern was expressed that given this practice, once accused, students are unable to progress through the system (i.e., register for additional courses) and the suggestion was made that students would be better off receiving a grade of zero on the work in question, until the issue is resolved. This was expressed as being particularly important for international students who need to remain enrolled at the University in order to remain in the country.

Others challenged this perspective, suggesting that despite being given an “incomplete” grade, students may in fact continue to register in courses and progress through their programs and that such a grade does not impact the ability of international students to remain in the country. Furthermore, it was suggested that being temporarily assigned a lower grade or a grade of F before being found to have committed misconduct could impact summer job prospects, co-op placements, the ability to remain in a program, etc. Reportedly, with the implementation of Bylaw 31, arrangements were made with the Office of the Registrar to prevent the automatic conversion of an INC to an F in order to prevent such situations from occurring.

Given that these conflicting perspectives or beliefs exist, and are held amongst those who conceivably are more involved with academic integrity than most faculty and staff, this is another area that requires clarification and improved communication.

**Recommendation 3c:** Clarify that in most instances faculty are to follow Bylaw 31, article 3.2.1 and report suspected cases of academic misconduct to their associate deans. Associate deans are in turn to report suspected cases to the AIO, via the University Secretariat – Senate Office Division. Adjust the AIO’s FAQ’s and Bylaw 31 JA Forms 1 and 2A to reflect this.

**Recommendation 3d:** Clarify that an incomplete grade does not prevent students from enrolling in required courses or programs while their cases are being heard. Ensure that this in fact the case.
There is also concern with the efficiency of the process beyond reporting issues. According to Form 2b (Bylaw 31 JA Forms - Form 2b), the associate dean is to review the documentation, meet with the student, advise him/her or the right to counsel and decide to either: i) dismiss the matter; ii) refer the matter to the AIO for investigation; or iii) if the student has admitted the misconduct and if given the nature of the misconduct an appropriate sanction falls within the preserve of the Associate Dean, request an expedited process from the AIO and the referral of the case back to the Associate Dean for sanctioning.

The opportunity to have expedited cases is a very attractive feature of the University of Windsor’s process and should be encouraged. However, participant interviews suggest that this option is rarely being used, particularly in instances where cases have gone directly to the AIO and process 3.1.1 is being followed. Hopefully having the vast majority of academic misconduct cases go through the associate deans as a first step will help in this regard. Furthermore, it would be helpful if this option were to be included – even emphasized - in the options provided to the associate deans on the Flow Chart that is available through the Senate Secretariat website (Bylaw 31 Flow Chart). The fact that the expedited process appears to be underutilized is consistent with the increase in the number of cases proceeding to formal judicial review, previously highlighted. Expressing concern with the current direction, in the words of one participant, “judicial panels should be the exception rather than the norm.”

In non-expedited cases, Bylaw 31 suggests that the AIO is to review the documentation, meet with the student and decide to either dismiss the charge, refer the case back to the Associate Dean/AAU Head or Vice-Provost Students and Registrar with the findings of the investigation and a recommendation for informal resolution (along with a recommended sanction), or will choose to lay formal charges against the student before a Judicial Panel.

If the AIO refers the case back (which happens only in cases where the student admits to the misconduct), it is up to the Associate Dean/AAU Head or Vice-Provost to impose the sanction, based on the AIO’s recommendation. However, if the Associate Dean/AAU or Vice-Provost is of the view that the matter
should/could not be resolved informally, then s/he is to refer it back to the AIO once more.

Once a decision to impose a sanction is made, information pertaining to prior sanctions is sought. If the case is a first offence the Associate Dean/AAU Head or Vice-Provost submits a formal report to the student, indicating the finding, sanction and right of appeal. If the case turns out to be a second or subsequent offence, then the case is forwarded to a Judicial Panel for a formal hearing.

This process as outlined appears to be confusing, inefficient and time consuming, with the case potentially bouncing back and forth between the Associate Dean and the AIO several times, particularly in the event of a second or subsequent offence.

A related issue pertains to the investigative approach taken by the AIO. While the AIO clearly commands a great deal of respect from her peers and was frequently cited as being extremely professional, dedicated and diligent, concern was expressed that in some instances she may be being “too thorough”. Several participants described the AIO’s investigative approach as detailed and legalistic (even “over-zealous”), and suggested that a better balance between due process and resolution is needed. According to one participant, “even when the case is cut and dry, there is clear evidence and the student has admitted fault, cases can take an inordinate amount of time. During the process the associate dean and faculty member are left on the sideline.” Yet another commented, “some recent cases could have been settled earlier and with more compassion”.

This concern is also reflected in the “Report from the Academic Advocate Office” (Kishnani, 2010) which states that the AIO engaged in “several months of investigation and attempted efforts to acquire incriminating statements from various students” (p. 9). Developing guidelines or norms pertaining to investigative processes (e.g., such as limiting the number of times an accused student or witness can be interviewed) may be helpful.

**Recommendation #3e: Track the number of expedited cases requested and implemented on an annual basis and encourage the associate deans and AIO to use this process as appropriate.**
Recommendation #3f: In non-expedited cases that can be informally resolved, have the associate dean impose the sanction directly, in consultation with the AIO.

Recommendation #3g: Encourage the more timely resolution of cases by establishing guidelines or norms pertaining to investigative processes.

Accompanying Bylaw 31 is a host of forms, templates and information pieces, including the document, Internal Procedure for Processing Complaints, which spells out processes and requirements etc. All of this material is essential to the smooth implementation of any complex administrative system and the University of Windsor is to be congratulated for its detailed efforts in this regard. One minor suggestion is that it would be helpful if a direct link to these forms was available through the AIO website (as well as the Senate Secretariat) and embedded in other documents (such as the FAQs).

One area of controversy, however, pertains to the extent to which guidelines pertaining to the student right to counsel are being followed. According to Form 2b (Bylaw 31 SA Forms – Form 2b), the associate deans are to indicate the date they met with the student and that “at the outset, advised him/her of the right to counsel.” In addition, the student is required to sign that this in fact did occur.

Similarly, the AIO is to review the relevant portions of Bylaw 31 with the student, inform them of their right to counsel, discuss the complaint and seek the student’s response. Furthermore, students are asked to sign a form that shows the meeting transpired in this order.

The “FAQ if Complaint Filed Against you” resource further informs students that they are welcome to bring an advisor with them to the meeting whether a “lawyer, a law student, the academic advocate, a friend, a parent, or a relative to offer you support, guidance or advice.” It also states that in the case of a formal charge, the student will receive a letter advising them of their right to seek legal representation along with contact information to the Legal Aid Office.

Despite the clarity of these expectations, it was the opinion of several of those interviewed that students are not always fully aware of their rights, particularly international students who may interpret the invitation to representation as being allowed to bring along a friend. Furthermore, it was suggested that in some
cases students may have been informed of their rights after they had already disclosed incriminating information and without being aware of the consequences of doing so. Finally, it was suggested that some students may feel pressured into admitting fault, despite being innocent, in order to avoid appearing before a Judicial Panel and the perceived threat of a stiffer penalty.

Providing a contrasting view, some participants felt too much emphasis has been placed on the “right to counsel” within the Windsor system, and that ideally a student and associate dean – particularly when engaged in an informal process - should be able to have a frank and honest conversation about what has transpired and what would be a reasonable consequence without a third party being present. Amongst many participants there was a sense that the Windsor process has become “overly legalistic” and “adversarial” and that too little emphasis is being placed on what it means to be a member of an academic community.

In short, on the one hand there appears to be the desire for greater transparency and recognition of student rights. On the other, there appears to be the desire to avoid premature escalation into formal, legal processes, and to instead emphasize the educational aspects of academic integrity. It is important that the University carefully consider the balance that it wants to achieve between these two ends.

One way of addressing the first need is through the Academic Advocate Office (AAO). The AAO was first opened in January 2008, employs two law students as Academic Advocates, and has provided confidential support to almost 200 students to date on a variety of issues. While only 4 of these cases purportedly pertain to academic integrity (Kishnani, 2010, p. 17), informal conversation suggests that many students have in fact sought advice from the AAO on this issue. Described as providing a “safe space,” the Academic Advocates stated function is to “advocate for and raise awareness of student rights...while mutually supporting the University’s goals of fostering an environment of respect, honesty, and academic integrity” (p. 3). Should the AAO be called upon to participate more actively in various institutional processes and events, such as the recommended year-long orientation program for new international students, they may be able to raise awareness in this regard.
At the same time, if more faculty are encouraged to follow process 3.2.1 and if more emphasis is placed on expedited processes as previously recommended, it may be the case that more students, while well advised of their rights, will opt to resolve the issue at hand in an informal manner.

Recommendaition #3h: The Academic Advocate Office (AAO) should continue to be promoted and supported as a resource for all students. They should also be increasingly invited to participate in various institutional processes and events, which will enhance their visibility and opportunity to have influence.

Recommendaition #3i: Greater collaboration and communication is needed between the AAO, AIO and Senate Secretariat. Joint linkages of website information pertaining to academic integrity is suggested as an important first step.

Finally, concerns were raised with respect to the mediation process. It was recognized that mediation has enormous potential and many possible benefits including greater efficiency, more creative solutions, and increased compliance and understanding. However, these outcomes are dependent on having a well designed process and this was called into question on a number of counts including the power imbalance of the participants (the student versus the AIO), along with the participants’ differential skill sets and knowledge bases, the dual role of the AIO, and conflicting objectives (education versus punishment). While Windsor has adopted a “facilitated” mediation process, it may be that the role of the Facilitator needs to be either clarified or enhanced in order to effectively deal with these tensions. For example, it was expressed that if in mediation, the student is expected to admit guilt and express remorse (to the AIO), but that agreement on an appropriate outcome cannot be facilitated, then the student would be at a disadvantage when he or she would subsequently have to face the AIO at a Judicial Panel hearing. Suggestions for improving aspects of the system involving mediation include introducing mediation much earlier in the process (such as when the student first meets with the associate dean), having someone other than the AIO serve as mediator on behalf of the University, and/or providing students with increased information and support (perhaps through the Advocates Office) in advance of their participation in the mediation process.
Recommendation #3j: Revisit the mediation process to improve its effectiveness. Revisit and clarify the role of the Mediator, consider introducing mediation as an option much earlier in the process, have someone other than the AIO serve as mediator on behalf of the University, and ensure students engaging in mediation are provided with adequate information and support (potentially through the Academic Advocate Office).

Sanctions

In imposing sanctions for academic misconduct a balance must be struck between deterrence and education, contingent upon the seriousness of the infraction and whether or not it is a first offence. The Windsor system provides for a range of penalties (as detailed in Bylaw 31). Associate Deans are authorized to impose admonition, letter of apology, mark reduction, repeat work for assessment, and recommendation to deny registration. The Vice-Provost is additionally authorized to impose censure, no-credit discipline (transcript notation), denial of registration, community service, restitution, and disciplinary probation. The Judicial Panel is additionally authorized to impose suspension, exclusion from campus facilities, exclusion from campus and expulsion. The President of the University is authorized to rescind degrees, based on a recommendation from a Judicial Panel or a Discipline appeal Committee.

Opinion on the University’s record in imposing sanctions is mixed. Some feel that by and large the penalties imposed have been too harsh, and not sufficiently educational in nature. This is particularly the case for international students, where extenuating circumstances are often involved, and suspension results in the additional penalty of having the student’s visa revoked. Others suggest that the penalties are too lax, particularly for some cases that have recently come before Judicial Review. Yet others complain that the imposed penalties are too narrow, and that the full range of possible sanctions is not being effectively utilized.

In fact, with the involvement of the associate deans having been curtailed over the past year and most cases being processed through the AIO and Judicial Review, the seriousness of sanctions has escalated. In particular, as previously
reported, 37% of the complaints filed resulted in suspensions last year (an increase from 20% the year prior) (Istl, 2009, p. 5). Whether this is a trend or an anomaly due to the type of cases being prosecuted remains to be seen.

Concern also exists with respect to role clarity. At Judicial Review, for example, current practice has the “minutes of settlement” recommended by the AIO and approved by the Judicial Panel. Some members of Judicial Panel suggested they were unclear as to whether or not they could overturn a recommendation of the AIO, despite the fact that JA Form 7d, clearly indicates that Judicial Panels are expected to either amend or approve the minutes of settlement, or bring the matter to formal hearing.

Others questioned whether or not it was even appropriate or necessary to have the AIO provide a recommendation, given her other roles in the process and the fact that guidelines and precedent exist.

Hopefully, if earlier recommendations are implemented, such as clarifying that faculty can in fact impose “warnings” alongside the increased use of expedited processes, more discretion will be brought to bear and more penalties at the lower range of the scale will be used if appropriate. With respect to Judicial Panels, greater clarity on member roles is needed.

Recommendation #3k: An orientation program for Judicial Panel members should be implemented (or if one already exists – enhanced), during which time all relevant forms and policies should be carefully reviewed.

Exam Invigilation

The University of Windsor’s Policy E3: Rules for Conduct of Examinations and Examination Medical Emergency (last amended December 5, 2006), outlines policies and procedures for administering examinations. It also makes reference to the St. Denis Centre, a facility that can accommodate up to 1300 students for writing exams. The Centre was used in the recent past for final exams with the Office of the Registrar serving as Presiding Examiner. However, this practice ceased several years ago when renovations were undertaken at the facility. Currently, all mid-terms and final exams are written in classrooms on campus and are the responsibility of the faculty member. While an examination facility has
been proposed, the current fiscal climate suggests acquiring funding for such a facility is unlikely in the near future.

Policy E3 outlines rules for setting up the examination room, admitting candidates, the use of photo ID and signatures, the role of invigilators, procedures for ending the exam, emergency procedures, conduct of candidates, test security procedures, guidelines to control cheating (including the suggestion that there should be no more than 30 candidates per invigilator and that examination copies should be securely stored prior to the exam), and guidelines for verifying the identify of students wearing facial garments.

In another FAQ document from the AIO, “GAs and TAs Frequently Asked Questions,” the question of what to do if the student has reported an incident of cheating and the faculty member appears to have done nothing about it is addressed. The document suggests mentioning it again and that if that doesn’t work reporting it to someone else such as an associate dean or the AIO. It also addresses the potential for TAs to participate in academic misconduct, by providing students with privileged information, inflating grades, or ignoring academic misconduct when it does occur. In highlighting the potential consequences of such behaviour, the document references a case where a graduate student was suspended for two years for helping a student cheat during an exam.

While these are excellent resources and progress has reportedly been made over the last several years with respect to these policies, in practice many critical issues remain. Participants suggested that cheating during mid-terms is “endemic” and that there is no infrastructure in place to deal with students who ignore direction (e.g., students who keep writing or talking to one another when told to stop). It was also suggested that students want greater decorum and enforcement of the rules in examination settings.

In the Report from the Academic Advocate Office, Kishnani (2010, p. 11), raises compliance concerns with respect to the lack of formal verification of student identify, the lack of protocols for addressing suspected cheating, and the use of identical exams across sections and times.
Issues exacerbating the potential to cheat during exams were identified by many participants. These included:

- Crowded classroom conditions that make it easy for students to see each other’s papers
- Few faculty prepare multiple versions of exams (scramble the order of exam questions)
- The Scantron Centre reportedly does not accommodate different versions of the same exam, while it is assumed that technically it would be possible to do so
- Lack of access to a large examination room makes having one sitting for multiple-sectioned course mid-terms logistically difficult
- The number of invigilators is often insufficient to maintain control of the exam (the university’s policies of 30 students/invigilator is not routinely followed)
- There is concern about how effectively TAs serve as invigilators, given their closeness to the students (the Faculty of Law uses external facilitators because of this issue)
- Invigilators (faculty and students) lack training for their roles and are often unsure how to deal with issues that arise
- Collective agreements may preclude the use of external invigilators to augment or replace TAs or GAs

While reengaging the St. Denis Centre as an examination facility would help to address many of the concerns outlined above, doing so will require resources. Furthermore, such resources will be wasted if the facility is not well used. A concern was raised by one participant that in the past, faculty who were assigned to have their students write in the Centre and preferred not to, would often introduce an alternative to the final, such as a take-home exam, and not inform the Registrar. As a result, resources were needlessly wasted. Furthermore, use of the facility without a concomitant increase in invigilation rigour will do little to improve the situation. The use of well-trained invigilators is needed if decorum is to be enhanced.
Participants also suggested that there are significant concerns with examination security at the University. In particular, they reported that exams are being stolen from faculty offices and that examination questions are leaked or sold in advance of exams being written. In order to discourage the latter, it is essential the facilities be provided so that all students in a course write the exam at the same time (for both mid-terms and finals). With respect to overall security, practices for storing exams varies considerably, with one faculty now using electronic swipe cards to control access to a central storage facility, along with sealed examination packages and a policy of picking up exams just 30 minutes prior to the start of an exam.

Concerns were also expressed with respect to the integrity of non-exam based assignments such as student papers and projects. Participants suggested that access to the full version of turnitin.com would be particularly helpful in this regard.

Finally, there is the need for greater understanding of authentic assessment and examination design, which can negate the need for close invigilation, such as the use of open book formats or questions that require critical analysis and long answers (as opposed to true and false or multiple-choice responses), and the increased use of community-based projects or other more novel forms of assessment.

While faculty members reportedly already receive instruction prior to every exam period (presumably with respect to invigilation procedures), given the concerns that participants shared, such information is clearly not sufficient or it is not being delivered in a sufficiently effective manner, to have the desired results.

**Recommendation #3l: Increase awareness amongst faculty about “best practices” for reducing the opportunity for students to cheat during exams, through faculty and department-based presentations and interactive discussions or workshops.**

**Recommendation #3m: Review invigilation guidelines for completeness and clarity and ensure all invigilators (faculty included) are trained (develop an on-line module depicting typical scenarios and test for awareness of appropriate responses) in advance of invigilating an exam.**
Recommendation #3n: Provide centrally administered examination facilities (e.g., the St. Denis Centre), prioritizing large, multi-sectioned courses (for both mid-terms and finals). Impose a penalty on faculties when examination facilities are booked and not used. Make compliance with 3l above, a condition of using the facility.

Recommendation #3o: Use individuals who are specifically hired and trained as invigilators as lead-invigilators in all exam settings (potentially personnel from the Registrar’s Office and/or retired teachers from the local community).

Recommendation #3p: Organize a session for associate deans with a focus on exam security (duplication and storage). Require all associate deans to develop a protocol for exam security within their faculties.

Recommendation #3q: Ensure the Scantron Centre is prepared to accommodate multiple versions of the same exam.

Recommendation #3r: Adopt the full version of turnitin.com.
IV. Organizational Structure: Positions and Level

The Academic Integrity Office (AIO) is a division of Student & Academic Services. It consists of a staff of two: the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) Danielle Istl (full time permanent) and an administrative assistant Maureen Friest (full time temporary). The AIO reports to the Vice-Provost Students and Registrar (Dr. Clayton Smith), who reports to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic (Dr. Leo Groarke).

For all intents and purposes Danielle Istl is the face of the Academic Integrity Office. As previously suggested, she is variously described by her colleagues, with genuine enthusiasm, as hard working, professional, knowledgeable, diligent, and dedicated, but also as detailed and legalistic. Perhaps the latter should not be surprising, as required qualifications of the AIO position include an LL.B. or equivalent and member in good standing with the Law Society of Upper Canada.

According to her job description, the stated purpose of the AIO is to “oversee the advancement of academic integrity and the effectiveness of the judicial affairs processes…with a focus on two key areas: (1) the processing of disciplinary complaints (both academic and non-academic) under Bylaw 31… and (2) academic integrity awareness and education” (HayGroup, HAY8E170.DOC).

Key job functions include serving as disciplinary counsel at all Judicial Panel and Discipline Appeal Committee hearings (25%) (including preparing witnesses and statements of fact, examining witnesses, and preparing opening and closing addresses); determining how complaints should be processed (formally or informally), recommending appropriate disciplinary sanctions, and acting on behalf of the University as Complainant in all dispute resolution forums including mediation (20%); investigating academic complaints (25%); advise students and faculty about the University’s disciplinary processes (10%); manage the University’s academic integrity awareness campaign (10%); plan and deliver educational programs and materials about academic integrity (10%).

Given the changes to Bylaw 31, however, some aspects of the AIO’s job description reportedly require updating and clarification. In particular, it was suggested that elements of the AIO’s job now fall to the University Secretariat -
Senate office division. In support of this change, this office recently received funding for a Judicial Affairs and Hearings Officer whose primary responsibility is reportedly to manage, oversee and advise on the judicial process and to provide Bylaw 31 interpretations. In order to avoid duplication and conflict between the two offices, it will be important to clarify – in writing – what aspects of the AIO’s job listed above are no longer her responsibility.

In some respects this change may be welcome. As previously suggested, concern has been expressed about a potential conflict of interest between some of the AIO’s roles, particularly with respect to the fact that she has been serving as both investigator and prosecutor. It was suggested by several participants that these roles should be separated into two positions. Underscoring the importance of this issue, one participant wrote:

My main concern stems from the lack of separation between the investigation arm of alleged academic misconduct complaints, and the prosecution arm…As a matter of law, this process robs the alleged student of the right to a full & fair hearing – which includes the right to cross examine the investigator…By placing investigation and prosecution within the same office – let alone the same person – the accused student has no recourse to cross-examining the academic integrity officer (in her role as investigator). Quite frankly, if this were any other court system, we would call into question the validity of ALL trials or settlements conducted in this manner.

This conflict is exacerbated when students have the perception that the AIO is there to advise them. Reflecting this tension, the student pamphlet Academic Integrity Matters – Earn Your Degree states that the AIO “is a resource for all members of the campus community as well as the office where misconduct complaints are processed.” Further the Report from the Academic Advocate Office (Kishnani, 2010) suggests the need to raise student awareness pertaining to the nature of negotiations with the AIO and the consequences of admitting to academic misconduct.

While I was unclear as to what the additional position in the Senate Secretariat will be responsible for, if the new Judicial Affairs and Hearings Officer were to assume one of the AIOs roles (investigator or prosecutor), this would resolve the perceived conflict and provide the opportunity for the AIO to focus on other aspects of her portfolio. In particular, very little time appears to have been
available to pursue some of the role’s more proactive educational elements. This may also help with respect to perceived role conflict involving mediation as well.

While this position was initially envisioned as a 50/50 split between offences and education, in writing less than 20% of the AIO’s time has been directly associated with education and prevention. And, in practice, less than 5% has been reportedly occurring. That said, there is no question that under the AIO’s leadership some high quality and creative educational programming has taken place (which is elaborated in the next section). However, much of this work has focused on students with respect to “cheating” and “enforcement” as opposed to enhancing the “integrity” of student work, encouraging faculty to engage in more authentic forms of assessment, or working with associate deans and heads in an effort to enhance the integrity of the academic climate. As a result, some participants offered that unless the AIO places more emphasis on integrity and education, the Office may need a new name to more accurately reflect its function. In the words of one participant, “enforcement at Windsor is as good as it gets.” Reflecting a somewhat less positive perspective, another said, “enforcement has taken over.”

In addition to the potential of the AIO having more time to focus on education through a shuffling of responsibilities, others suggested that the Office be given additional resources. For example, some suggested that one or more faculty members who have a passion for academic integrity be seconded to the AIO. Such individuals could be responsible for championing academic integrity amongst their counterparts across the institution. Discussion topics or workshops might focus on alternative forms of assessment, effective exam development, sound invigilation practices and exam security, and how to create a classroom culture that encourages integrity.

Alternately, the education function of the AIO might best remain focused on students, with faculty education more effectively championed elsewhere, such as within the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The challenge with this suggestion is that despite its mandate, depth of expertise in educational development, and the range of professional development activities it supports, the CTL is narrowly perceived by some as a centre for audio-visual support. This perception would need to be addressed and confidence in the Centre enhanced, if
it were to effectively assume this role. In addition, if this direction were to be taken, in order to ensure coordination it may be appropriate to align the CTL and the AIO by having both units report into the same administrative position.

Another issue pertaining to organizational structure is the fact that the Administrative Assistant to the AIO is not a permanent position. Given the critical role of the Office and this position, and the potential downside if staff turnover were to occur, this issue should be addressed as soon as possible. Furthermore, it was suggested that the procedural work associated with Bylaw 31 would be far more efficiently handled if the university were to adopt an automated, customized system for generating reports, forms, and emails. Such a system is available and estimated to cost in the neighbourhood of $100,000.

In addition to these challenges, more needs to be done to promote a sense of shared responsibility for promoting and upholding academic integrity across the institution. The Report from the Academic Advocate Office (Kishnani, 2010, p. 12) suggests the establishment of an Academic Advisory Group including the AIO, Academic Advocates, Vice-Provost Students and Registrar, and the Associate Deans/AAU Heads of all faculties. While a working group on Academic Integrity already does exist, it is not clear whether or not this is a permanent group and whether its composition is sufficiently broad. Establishing a permanent council, potentially also including representation from the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Residences, Senate Secretariat, AAO, Registrar, International Student Centre, Student Alliance etc. should be considered. Such a group would be charged with identifying issues and priorities (such as those contained within this report), and coordinating efforts from across the institution to address them.

In summary, the following is recommended:

**Recommendation #4a: The role of the AIO needs to be clarified with respect to procedural changes introduced through Bylaw 31, the addition of the Judicial Affairs and Hearings Officer position in the University Secretariat - Senate office, and the well recognized need to separate the roles of investigation and prosecution (and mediation).**

**Recommendation #4b: Consideration should be given to providing the Academic Integrity Office with additional resources, in the form of faculty secondments, to
allow them to champion training and development opportunities for faculty and administrators, with respect to academic integrity. Alternately, the CTL could be asked to explicitly assume this mandate.

Recommendation #4c: The University should invest in available technology to automate the processes associated with Bylaw 31.

Recommendation #4d: The Administrative Assistant to the Academic Integrity Officer should be made a full-time permanent position.

Recommendation #4e: An Academic Integrity Council should be established, consisting of key stakeholders to coordinate the identification and resolution of issues, in support of academic integrity.
V. Awareness and Education

The AIO has been available (more in the past than has recently been the case) for one-on-one faculty and student consultations; customized class presentations; orientation events for new students (including workshops for international students), faculty, and TAs; and for participation at departmental meetings. The AIO has also produced promotional materials, documents and website material in support of Academic Integrity. One such item is the Academic Integrity Matters – Earn Your Degree brochure, previously noted that is directed at students. This brochure highlights university policies of most relevance to students (i.e., Senate Bylaw 31: Student Affairs and Integrity; Senate Policy E3: Rules of Conduct for Examinations; Senate Policy P4: Plagiarism Policy; Senate Policy P5: Graduate Studies Policy on Authorship and Plagiarism; Senate Policy S6: Student Code of Conduct; and Senate Policy T1: Policy on the Use of Turnitin.com; and Senate Policy U1: Unacceptable Use of Computer Resources).

The brochure also references resources pertaining to research, writing and time management; tips for success including suggestions for preventing plagiarism, copyright infringement and exam protocol; and perhaps most importantly, testimonials from students charged with exam cheating and student misconduct. Students asked about what messages they are most likely to pay attention to routinely cite testimonials from other students who have actually been charged with academic misconduct cases and suffered significant consequences. This helps counter the impression that many students hold that academic misconduct policies are rarely implemented and even if they are, that significant consequences are not often levied.

The University of Windsor has also produced a series of creative posters, two of which were recently featured in an article published in the TCC 2010 Conference Proceedings (Dyer, 2010). Local opinion as to the effectiveness of these posters is mixed with faculty much preferring the most recent efforts that focus on the positive aspects of academic integrity (having the “courage” to “find the inner strength to climb your own mountain”) rather than depictions of wandering eyes or other forms of cheating and dishonesty. According to one participant, “our
focus has been on ‘don’t cheat’ and scaring students rather than helping them learn how to work with academic and intellectual integrity.”

Other documents for students include information on the University’s Code of Conduct, Plagiarism Policy, Acceptable Use Policy, Plagiarism & Citation, Bylaw 31, and FAQ resources. The development of a mandatory plagiarism tutorial has been proposed by the AIO for the 2010/11 academic year. Participants interviewed support this idea, suggesting that all first year students should have to complete an on-line module and take an oath pledging to approach their work with integrity.

The University of Windsor also has an Academic Writing Centre that provides English language development support and information pertaining to plagiarism and citation, offered through workshops, seminars and one-on-one assistance.

Resources for faculty (in addition to those above) are also available such as the FAQs previously cited. Other resources include a new standard medical certificate, Confidentiality Agreements/Statement of Honesty templates for exams and assignments, and recommended on-line resources such as a “Student’s True Story” to help trigger in-class conversations on academic integrity. Print resources developed elsewhere and made available through the AIO include “Ten Principles of Academic Integrity” (McCabe and Pavela), which includes suggestions for developing an effective learning environment.

Most recently, the AIO proposed the introduction of an AIO Certificate or award to be given to faculty who are “vigilant about academic integrity” (AIO – Internal Procedure for Processing Complaints, p. 1). Concern with the proposed award has surfaced, with participants suggesting that rather than encouraging faculty to “catch cheaters” or to adopt a “bounty hunter” mentality, it would be better to encourage faculty to deter cheating from happening in the first place.

Suggestions for enhancing awareness and education for students included the further use of student testimonials and ensuring workshops are time appropriate (rather than focus on orientation, messages should target critical points of academic activity, spread throughout the year, such as just before mid-terms and final exams).
As previously suggested, the biggest gap in awareness and education is in the development of educational material and learning opportunities for faculty and administrators. Given that several of the University’s more high-profile academic misconduct cases appear to be associated with questionable approaches to assessment, addressing effective assessment practice may prove particularly helpful in reducing such incidents in the future. Multiple choice exams that largely test for short-term recall; relying on textbook test banks, with questions available on-line to the technology-savvy student; the use of take-home exams and problem sets with right and wrong answers (as opposed to requiring the development of original analyses and argument); reusing old exams, assignments and laboratory exercises from semester to semester (where some students have access to previously graded material and others do not); or using the same exam across sections of the same course, are all examples of questionable assessment practices. Within this context, students can develop resentment to what they perceive as a “game playing” environment or an “uneven playing field,” and be motivated to engage in academic misconduct as a result.

Other opportunities concerning faculty and administrators include:

- the development of statements for inclusion on course outlines (pertaining to both policies and resources)
- discussions concerning how faculty can best model integrity in their own comportment (e.g., coming to class on time, setting fair exams, giving meaningful and timely feedback, citing sources in presentations and handouts)
- reviewing tenure and promotion practices and course evaluations with respect to the extent to which they seek to assess integrity in teaching, such as assessment design, quality of feedback, diligence in invigilating exams

These latter ideas are captured in recommendations made previously in this document.

*Recommendation #5a: Consistent with current plans, an on-line module on academic integrity should be developed, and all first year students required to*
complete it, including taking an oath pledging to approach their work with integrity.

Recommendation #5b: The idea of an academic award for faculty should be rethought to ensure it recognizes faculty who are able to create effective cultures of integrity in their classrooms, rather than those who are most vigilant at pursuing charges against students.

In conclusion, the University of Windsor has made great strides in its efforts towards academic integrity and should be proud of its accomplishments to date. Opportunities for enhancing these efforts exist in a number of areas as outlined in this report. I wish the University and its members every success in prioritizing opportunities and implementing preferred recommendations.
I. Prevalence of Academic Misconduct

Recommendation #1a: The 2006 academic integrity survey should be repeated in a year or so (as is planned), to ascertain if changes in reported student and faculty behaviours and perceptions have occurred.

Recommendation #1b: The results of the academic integrity survey should be analyzed by faculty/department in order to more clearly identify issues and “best practices” across the institution.

*Proposed new Recommendation 1a-b:* The 2006 academic integrity survey should be repeated in a year or so (as is planned), to ascertain if changes in reported student and faculty behaviours and perceptions have occurred, and the results of the survey should be analyzed in order to more clearly identify issues and “best practices” across the institution.

Recommendation #1c: More focus is needed on education and prevention and the sharing of ideas and best practices across the institution. The active involvement of faculty and associate deans/heads is essential in this regard.

Recommendation #1d: An annual meeting, *focussing on one or two key themes,* should be held that brings together deans and associate deans to review academic integrity reports and policies, discuss concerns and successes, and to share ideas and practices for fostering local cultures that support academic integrity.
II. International Students

Recommendation #2a: Ensure associate deans/heads are well trained in coaching their faculty and assessing the merits of potential academic misconduct cases, including distinguishing between the need for an educational response (i.e., a “teachable moment”) and a punitive response. This would require a bylaw change however. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.

Recommendation #2b: Continue to endeavour to ensure diverse representation (students and faculty) on all Judicial Panels.

Recommendation #2c: Test all ESL students for English proficiency upon arrival at the University of Windsor (potentially as part of existing courses such as the Foundations of Academic Writing course). Stream students into programs and course sections as appropriate.

It is not only ESL students that need assistance with English. This recommendation should be for all students.

Proposed new recommendation 2c: Test all students for English proficiency upon arrival at the University of Windsor (potentially as part of existing courses such as the Foundations of Academic Writing course). Stream students into programs and course sections as appropriate.

Recommendation #2d: Institute a year-long semester orientation program for international students, offered every semester, in collaboration with the International Student Centre, that combines both academic and social elements.
Include academic integrity as one of the topics covered, approximately one month after the semester has begun.

**Note:** Work is being done an academic integrity module or quiz (one for undergraduate and one for graduate students) which will be piloted in 2011 as optional for students, with the hope of making it mandatory for all new students in 2012. Students would then not be able to register in their second semester until they had completed the module or quiz.

Recommendation #2e: Provide faculty at the beginning of each year with a list of resources available to all students (something that is easily posted to a bulletin board). In keeping with the University’s strategic directions, have Deans or Associate Deans/Heads suggest to their faculty that they make a point of explicitly welcoming their international students and encourage them to engage with the orientation program and other supports that are available to them.

This should not be specific to international students. All students should be explicitly welcomed and informed of available support services.

**Proposed new recommendation 2e(i):** Provide faculty at the beginning of each year with a list of resources available to all students (something that is easily posted to a bulletin board).

**Recommendations 2e(ii):** In keeping with the University’s strategic directions, have Deans or Associate Deans/Heads suggest to their faculty that they make a point of explicitly welcoming their students and encouraging them to engage with orientation programs and other supports that are available to them.

III. Policies and Procedures: Transparency and Accountability

**Recommendation 3a:** Clarify the circumstances (if any) under which faculty may deal with minor infractions on their own as well as the limits of their ability to impose sanctions. Given consideration to amending Bylaw 31 to allow faculty the ability to impose a “warning” which may require the student to do the work again and/or complete an on-line educational module on academic integrity.
This recommendation would require a bylaw change to implement. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.

Recommendation 3b: Extend the current mechanism for tracking students who receive sanctions, maintained by the Senate Secretariat, to include those imposed by faculty, consistent with 3a above. **This recommendation would require a bylaw change to implement. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.**

Recommendation 3c: Clarify that in most instances faculty are to follow Bylaw 31, article 3.2.1 and report suspected cases of academic misconduct to their associate deans. Associate deans are in turn to report suspected cases to the AIO, via the University Secretariat – Senate Office Division. Adjust the AIO’s FAQ’s and Bylaw 31 JA Forms 1 and 2A to reflect this.

**There appears to have been a misunderstanding. Academic misconduct cases do come on a JA Form 2a. Non-academic misconduct cases come on a SA Form 1.**

**Proposed new recommendation 3c:** Clarify that faculty are to follow Bylaw 31, article 3.2.1 and report suspected cases of academic misconduct to their Associate Deans via the University Secretariat – Senate Office Division.

Recommendation 3d: Clarify that an incomplete grade does not prevent students from enrolling in required courses or programs while their cases are being heard. Ensure that this in fact the case.
This has been done. A memo is circulated regularly notifying instructors of the incomplete provision. The last one circulated was on September 15, 2010. Recommendation completed.

Recommendation #3e: Track the number of expedited cases requested and implemented on an annual basis and encourage the associate deans and AIO to use this process as appropriate.

Recommendation #3f: In non-expedited cases that can be informally resolved, have the associate dean impose the sanction directly, in consultation with the AIO. This recommendation would require a bylaw change to implement. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.

Recommendation #3g: Encourage the more timely resolution of cases by establishing guidelines or norms pertaining to investigative processes.

The AIO feels that it is not possible to establish guidelines or norms for investigations given the variety of cases that come forward.

Proposed new recommendation 3g: Encourage the more timely resolution of cases, where appropriate.

Recommendation #3h: The Academic Advocate Office (AAO) should continue to be promoted and supported as a resource for all students, with efforts made to
secure base funding for the office. Academic Advocates They should also be increasingly invited to participate in various institutional processes and events, which will enhance their visibility and opportunity to have influence.

Recommendation #3i: Greater collaboration and communication is needed between the AAO, AIO and Senate Secretariat. Joint linkages of website information pertaining to academic integrity is suggested as an important first step.

Recommendation #3j: Revisit the mediation process to improve its effectiveness. Revisit and clarify the role of the Mediator, consider introducing mediation as an option much earlier in the process, have someone other than the AIO serve as mediator on behalf of the University, ensure students engaging in mediation are provided with adequate information and support (potentially through the Academic Advocate Office).

Recommendation 3j has four parts. Here it is with comments for each part:

Recommendation #3j: Revisit the mediation process to improve its effectiveness. Revisit and clarify the role of the Mediator, Agreed

c Consider introducing mediation as an option much earlier in the process, This part of the recommendation would require a bylaw change to implement. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.

Have someone other than the AIO serve as mediator on behalf of the University, This part of the recommendation would require a bylaw change to implement. Agree that it should be considered and as such recommend forwarding to the Bylaw Review Committee.
ensure students engaging in mediation are provided with adequate information and support (potentially through the Academic Advocate Office). Agreed.

Recommendation #3k: An orientation program for Judicial Panel members should be implemented (or if one already exists – enhanced), during which time all relevant forms and policies should be carefully reviewed. Agreed. The Judicial Affairs and Hearings Officer has begun implementing this recommendation.

Recommendation #3l: Increase awareness amongst faculty about “best practices” for reducing the opportunity for students to cheat during exams, through faculty and department-based presentations and interactive discussions or workshops. Agreed. Enter into discussions with Alan Wright and Erika Kustra to determine how best to move forward with this recommendation.

Recommendation #3m: Review invigilation guidelines for completeness and clarity and ensure all invigilators (faculty included) are trained (develop an online module depicting typical scenarios and test for awareness of appropriate responses) in advance of invigilating an exam.

Recommendation #3n: Provide centrally administered examination facilities (e.g., the St. Denis Centre), prioritizing large, multi-sectioned courses (for both mid-terms and finals). Impose a penalty on faculties when examination facilities are booked and not used. Make compliance with 3l above, a condition of using
the facility. **This is not feasible. It cannot be provided given resource constraints.**
Recommend removing this recommendation.

Recommendation #3o: Use individuals who are specifically hired and trained as invigilators as lead-invigilators in all exam settings (potentially personnel from the Registrar’s Office and/or retired teachers from the local community). **This has resource implications and as such may not be do-able. Law does this and it would be interesting to know what the experience has been.**

Recommendation #3p: Organize a session for associate deans with a focus on exam security (duplication and storage). Require all associate deans to develop a protocol for exam security within their faculties.

Recommendation #3q: Ensure the Scantron Centre is prepared to accommodate multiple versions of the same exam. **This appears to be already the case. IT has confirmed that instructors may create one exam, jumble the questions and produce another exam for the same class. In such cases, only the average for the class will need to be calculated manually.**

Recommendation #3r: Adopt the full version of turnitin.com. **Turnitin.com has not been used by instructors to the fullest extent possible although every year since its adoption use has increased. During the last review of the software, it was decided that the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students and International would no longer support the program. IT may or may not pick it up in the next**
budget year. The "full version" of Turnitin.com is called WriteCycle and now includes peer review (PeerMark) and grading (GradeMark) in addition to Originality Check. We are not currently equipped to integrate these additional products; as such, the University may retain the Originality Check product only.

IV. Organizational Structure: Positions and Level

Recommendation #4a: The role of the AIO needs to be clarified with respect to procedural changes introduced through Bylaw 31, the addition of the Judicial Affairs and Hearings Officer position in the University Secretariat - Senate office, and the well recognized need to separate the roles of investigation and prosecution (and mediation).

Recommendation #4b: Consideration should be given to providing the Academic Integrity Office with additional resources, in the form of faculty secondments, to allow them to champion training and development opportunities for faculty and administrators, with respect to academic integrity. Alternately, the CTL could be asked to explicitly assume this mandate. Enter into discussions with Alan Wright and Erika Kustra to see how/if CTL could assist with this.

Recommendation #4c: The University should invest in available technology to automate the processes associated with Bylaw 31. The University Secretariat has purchased software that will go a long way to assisting in the automation of the process managed by this office. However, IT has informed us that there is a minimum of 2 years to go before implementation.

Recommendation #4d: The Administrative Assistant to the Academic Integrity Officer should be made a full-time permanent position.
Recommendation #4e: An Academic Integrity Council should be established, consisting of key stakeholders to coordinate the identification and resolution of issues, in support of academic integrity.

Consider making this “Council” a subcommittee of one of the Senate Standing Committees which will give it a more direct line to Senate and enhance its profile. This would require that the composition adheres to the requirements of Senate bylaws (3:1 faculty-student ratio). Consider renaming the “Council” since integrity matters are not only academic in nature.

V. Awareness and Education

Recommendation #5a: Consistent with current plans, an on-line module on academic integrity should be developed, and all first year students required to complete it, including taking an oath pledging to approach their work with integrity. This will require Senate approval. This is in the works. See comments under recommendation 2d.

Recommendation #5b: The idea of an academic award for faculty should be rethought to ensure it recognizes faculty who are able to create effective cultures of integrity in their classrooms, rather than those who are most vigilant at pursuing charges against students.

The AIO Certificate of Recognition is given to all those who have been identified as being actively involved in furthering the academic integrity message. Because the AIO mostly hears from individuals who file complaints, the certificate has been associated with the disciplinary process. However, the AIO, through its website, invites people to advise the AIO of anyone in their faculty or on campus who is 'going the extra mile in promoting academic integrity' so that certificates may also be issued to those individuals; whether they are providing modules on how to properly cite your work, to other educational programming that will further academic integrity on campus. The AIO will make greater efforts to
spread the word about the certificate. Note: the certificate is not an “award”. It is given to all who have been identified as helping to further the academic integrity message.

Proposed new recommendation #5b: That increased efforts be made to recognize faculty who are able to create effective cultures of integrity in their classrooms, rather than those who are most vigilant at pursuing charges against students.
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