

ENG

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Best Practice Programme in Promoting Academic Integrity

Example of a Submission (using a hypothetical and non-COVID 19 related practice example)

Part I: APPLICANT

Representative ▶	Jo Brilliant
Title/Position ▶	Director
Name of Institution/Student Union ▶	University of Northern Hemisphere
Email Address ▶	Job@unh.edu
BEST PRACTICE DETAILS	
Title ▶	Academic Integrity Office
Institution ▶	University of Northern Hemisphere
Country ▶	USA
Language(s) ▶	English
Website (if available) ▶	http://academicintegrity.unh.edu
CATEGORY OF BEST PRACTICE (if your application falls into several categories, please pick ONE category that best suits)	
Teaching & Learning ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
Policy ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procedures ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
Governance/Structures ▶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Training ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
TARGET GROUP(S)	
Teaching/Academic Staff ▶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Staff ▶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students ▶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify) ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL	
Institutional ▶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Individual Faculties/Programmes (e.g., biological sciences) ▶	<input type="checkbox"/>

Individual Classrooms ►	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify) ►	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part II: THE PRACTICE

Practice Description – Short

Provide a one sentence description/summary of the practice ▼

The Academic Integrity Office (Office) at the University of Northern Hemisphere promotes and supports a culture of integrity in order to reinforce quality teaching and learning.

Practice Description-Long (max 250 words)

Summarise the practice. Make sure to address what it is, its key activities/components, what problem/issue/challenge it addresses, and what population it impacts. ▼

The mission of the Academic Integrity Office (Office) at the University of Northern Hemisphere is to promote and support a culture of integrity in order to reinforce quality teaching and learning. The Office is the central repository for all faculty reports of suspected academic integrity violations; we keep track of cases, conduct resolution meetings with students, organise hearings, and shepherd cases throughout the process. The Office also conducts all of the campus academic integrity education to prevent cheating, and we conduct after-education to students who have violated academic integrity.

The Office was created in 2003 after a thorough review of the University’s academic integrity policy. Faculty identified serious problems with the policy, procedures, and governance structures existing at that time. Faculty identified long delays in case resolutions, poor communication about cases, lack of education and training in the campus community, and poor support for their teaching efforts.

The Office impacts the entire University population serving undergraduate and graduate students. Through its activities, the Office reduces the workload and strain on other administrative staff who previously had to provide academic integrity support, alleviates work and worry of faculty who now have complete support in pursuing integrity violations, and helps to create a fair and honest learning environment for students.

Problem Explanation (max 500 words)

What was the problem/issue/challenge that existed before the practice was implemented? What is known to have caused the problem, how did the problem impact the higher education community, and who in the higher education community did it impact? ▼

In 2003, when the Office began with the hire of a single Academic Integrity Officer, 235 cases of academic integrity violations opened between the period of 2003-2006 were unresolved. There were significant gaps in communication with faculty and students about cases – some received notifications, some did not. Student grades remained undetermined for all of these cases. There was little preventative education being conducted (aside from a small word at new student orientation) and it was perceived that cheating was commonplace.

From the external review conducted, it became apparent that the bottleneck was occurring in the Office of Judicial Affairs. The staff was not following Policy and the procedures they were using to keep track of cases were not codified. And this was not recognized until faculty brought it to the attention of Faculty Senate; in other words, there was mismanagement of the Policy and no oversight of the Office that was in charge, allowing the problem to grow and fester.

The problem negatively impacted faculty the most – they wanted to protect academic integrity of their classes, but they felt little no institutional support to do so. Next, the problem impacted the student body who were confused about integrity standards and rules, unsure of how they could get allegations of integrity violations resolved, and open cases meant that their academic progress was threatened.

Conceptual Basis (max 500 words)

What research or theoretical frameworks were considered in creating this practice? How have the ICAI values (honesty, fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness and courage) been integrated into the practice? ▼

I don't believe any research, theoretical or values-based frameworks were considered when the Office was created at the time.

However, best practices in the field, research on cheating, and the ICAI values have been considered throughout the evolution of the Office. For example, motivation theory and its relation to why students cheat, as well as bystander research and theory and research on moral development and ethical decision-making have all been considered in our design of preventative and after-education. Best practices like the UK's Plagiarism Tariff and integrity affirmations (also backed by the research) informed our Sanctioning Guidelines and our honor pledge. ICAI's values of fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, honesty and courage have been incorporated into our Policy, our procedures, and throughout our Office. The values inform our mission and our Office values, our annual events (e.g., a Ceremony & a Contest), and our culture – we even have physical pillars for each value!

Main Activities (max 500 words)

Briefly describe main activities of the practice, referring to timelines if applicable. ▼

2003: full-time Academic Integrity Officer hired, reported directly to the VP Student Affairs
2004: part-time administrative assistant hired; all of the unresolved cases were resolved and closed; Office took over the academic dishonesty hearings
2005: Development through Integrity Program (education after a violation) was initiated, and student staff were hired to assist with educational efforts
2006: administrative assistant became full-time; Student Staff contingent grew to 8 students; other educational workshops were implemented in collaboration with the Library, the Writing Center, and Faculty
2007: Sanctioning Guidelines created; an academic integrity awards Ceremony implemented; Student Staff grew to 12 students; Integrity Advisory Council was formed
2008: part-time contractor employed to help supervise the Student Staff and teach the Development through Integrity Program
2010: Integrity Contest implemented; Policy revised from "academic dishonesty" to "academic integrity", including the creation of the Academic Integrity Review Board
2011: part-time staff position (Education Coordinator) created to supervise Student Staff and give educational presentations and workshops (including Developing through Integrity Program)
2013: Education Coordinator became full-time; Academic Integrity Officer position became Director
2014: Sanctioning Guidelines revised to make education after an integrity violation mandatory and to make sanctions for cheating more clear; new full-time staff position created (Case Officer) to support case management workload
2015: review of Policy and procedures began, including the process of separating procedures from Policy; implemented a Supplementary Proctor Program
2016: celebrated 10 years; hosted a regional International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) conference
2017: hired 3 new full-time staff positions: Case Officer, Senior Case Officer and Assistant Director; implemented significant Policy and Procedural changes
2018: Academic Integrity Policy Committee constituted

Number of People Reached by the Practice

If available, provide a percentage of the total target population. ▼

All faculty, undergraduate and graduate students are reached by the AI Office Practice. The Office does not serve Medical or Pharmacy faculty and students. So, we reach 95% of the student body and faculty body.

Stakeholder Involvement (max 250 words)

Indicate the institutional roles (e.g. librarian, student, instructor) of those involved in designing and implementing the practice. Describe briefly how each role contributed to the best practice. ▼

When the Office was created, faculty, students, and student affairs staff were all involved in the process of creating the origin of the Office – the Academic Integrity Officer. The external review process gathered the opinions of all stakeholders and incorporated their ideas into the final plan.

Throughout the evolution of the Office, stakeholders have been actively involved. Our education has been created and taught in collaboration with Librarians, Writing Center staff, writing program faculty, computer science & engineering faculty, and students. Our Integrity Advisory Council, which advises on education and outreach, has representation from academic advisors, athletics, the library, faculty, academic administration, success centers, writing center, student government, Office for Students with Disabilities, and student services. We have a newly formed Academic Integrity Policy Committee, which includes representation from across the campus – this committee makes changes to policy, procedures, and sanctioning guidelines.

Cost of Practice

Provide the approximate cost for implementing the practice. Indicate the source of the funds. ▼

The total cost of the Office (as of 2018), to serve 95% of the student and faculty body, is approximately \$800,000, less than 2% of the University’s operating budget. To put it another way, the cost of the Office is about \$17 for every faculty and student member served. The funds come from the general University operating budget because it is considered an essential operating structure.

Initial Impact and Evaluation (max 500 words)

Indicate initial impact of the practice – what changes resulted and for whom? Describe how the practice/results/impact are evaluated, if applicable. If any evaluation results are available, summarise them and/or provide references if published results are available. If applicable, attach any documents/links supporting the outcome and effectiveness of the practice. ▼

The implementation of the Office resulted in significant changes for the entire University campus. Reports of integrity violations increased 3-fold; this indicates greater faculty compliance with Policy which mandates the report of violation to the Office. Faculty surveys of the Office indicate 98% satisfaction with the AI Office and the services it provides. The number of reports submitted by students of cheating by other students (something that takes a significant amount of courage to do) has increased 1000%. The process is working because 90% of cases are now resolved within 30 business days, and 70% of students feel that the process is fair.

Please see the attached evaluation report conducted by a third party.

Replicability (max 250 words)

Briefly describe if/how this practice can be implemented in another context (other country or higher education institution) ▼

The establishment and day-to-day operations of the Office has been informed by best practices on national and global level as well as on research in the field, and it should thus be possible to apply a similar structure in other contexts. For example, best practices from UK’s Plagiarism Tariff and integrity affirmations informed our Sanctioning Guidelines and our Honor Pledge.

In the design of our education activities to prevent cheating and after-education activities for students who have violated academic integrity, research and theory (i.e. motivation theory, research on moral development, and ethical decision-making) have been considered. (For more details on this, see the section on Conceptual Basis)

While the manifestation of academic integrity governance and structures is unique to each higher education institution, we believe that the steps undertaken and the experiences gained can be replicated and adapted to other countries or higher education institutions wishing to set-up an academic integrity office. (For more

details on the steps, see the section on Main Activities). In addition, the staff of the Office is willing to share their experiences for those who would be interested in implementing this practice.