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ABSTRACT

Academic integrity and trustworthiness are essential values in an institution of higher education. Cheating that goes unchecked threatens the integrity of the academic community. Rampant cheating on a college campus may establish a norm of academic dishonesty that could erode the core academic values of the university.

The site of this project is Lehigh University, a private, selective, residential research university in the Mid-Atlantic United States. During the course of this project, a combination of methods shed light on the campus climate related to academic integrity. Faculty, student, and administrative staff attitudes toward and perceptions of academic dishonesty were examined. A hybrid design of qualitative and quantitative research methods was employed using observation, interviews, critical incidents technique, and a survey. In addition, nationally recognized measures, theories, and frameworks were employed to assess the current campus academic integrity culture and make informed decisions about interventions that would improve the campus ethos.

A discussion of the significant progress made towards improving the campus climate is presented. Finally, recommendations are offered to support continuous improvement as Lehigh University strives to embody a campus culture that promotes integrity of all types.

Although college students bear some responsibility for cheating behavior, it is clear that faculty, administrators, and university policies are crucial influences in the establishment of a campus culture that values academic integrity. A campus culture
that deeply values integrity can promote an environment where students are less likely to cheat and faculty members are more likely to report incidents.
Chapter 1

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Introduction

Academic integrity is a core value for institutions of higher education. When students engage in dishonest or fraudulent academic practices there can be grave consequences for them and their institution. Much research and theoretical work has been conducted to understand what compels students to cheat. However, only recently has there been more attention in the research to the significant impact a campus ethos and culture can have on reducing the prevalence of academic dishonesty. Faculty members, students and administrators all play significant roles in contributing to a campus climate that values academic integrity.

In this Executive Position Paper I tell the story of academic integrity at Lehigh University over the period of a decade. Lehigh University is a private research university in the Mid-Atlantic United States. I have worked at Lehigh University in various student affairs positions for the past twenty five years. Since 1999 I’ve served as the Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students. However, my interest in academic integrity began earlier in my career when I served as the University’s conduct officer. In that role, I was exposed to students accused of academic dishonesty and faculty members who reported cheating. In addition, I was responsible for managing the student conduct hearing process and training the University Committee on Discipline (UCOD) panel members.
Subsequent to serving as the University Conduct Officer, I was the Associate Dean of Students for Academic Services for several years. In this position, I spent most of my time interfacing with the academic leadership in each of the four colleges: Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Applied Sciences, Business, and Education. In all of my roles at the University, I remained connected to the topic of academic integrity and worked intimately with academic policy development, assisted individual students, collaborated with faculty on policy committees, advised the undergraduate Student Senate, and assisted with the strategic planning of the Student Affairs division. In all of these roles, I attempted to understand the dynamics of academic dishonesty on this campus in order to make informed administrative decisions, offer recommendations, and build partnerships that would improve the campus climate related to academic integrity.

When I began my doctoral work at University of Delaware, I knew from day one that my eventual executive position paper topic would examine the broad topic of academic integrity. In addition to my professional experiences at Lehigh University, I took every opportunity to dive deeply into the topic. I became a member of the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) and on three occasions attended the CAI national conference. During my doctoral course work, each time I had the opportunity to select a topic for a paper or project, I chose some aspect of academic integrity. As a result, I had a rich background and understanding of the topic when I wrote my executive position paper proposal. At that time, I had already completed observation studies of several academic dishonesty conduct hearings and conducted an in depth 3 hour interview with a tenured faculty member about the topic.
As an administrator, I had significant exposure to faculty, administrative, and student contributions to campus culture. I was also fortunate to spend significant time engaging with students on the topic of academic integrity through advising student organizations and meeting with hundreds of students individually. However, I needed to learn more about the faculty perspective in order to round out my conceptual framework and inform decisions about policy development, future directions, and interventions to improve campus’s ethos related to academic integrity values. This need to gain a deeper understanding of the faculty perceptions of, and viewpoints about, academic dishonesty at Lehigh University became a priority for me as I began this work. Once I had a better understanding of academic integrity from the viewpoint of Lehigh University faculty, that knowledge combined with my sense of administrator and student experiences led me to make informed decisions and implement action steps in an effort to improve the campus context as it relates to academic integrity.

During the course of conducting research for the executive position paper, I regularly incorporated the insights that occurred in my daily work. As a result, I was able to make evidence based recommendations that have already been implemented at Lehigh University. Numerous practices, policies, and initiatives to improve the campus climate related to academic integrity have been introduced during this project. In addition, campus dialogs were nurtured that should improve the campus culture moving forward, encourage more faculty members to report incidents of observed cheating, and perhaps reduce the overall prevalence of students’ academic dishonesty behaviors. This executive position paper tells the story of how my sustained interest and research into the concept of academic dishonesty at Lehigh University affected the
campus climate related to academic integrity. It also provides a road map for future improvements.

Chapter one provides an overview of academic integrity at colleges and universities nationally, a scan of the literature, and a description of academic integrity at Lehigh University. Chapter two discusses the data gathered and utilized to better understand academic integrity at Lehigh University. Chapter three discusses the interventions, practices, initiatives, and policies implemented over the past decade based on informed decisions. Chapter three also portrays the progress made in improving the Lehigh University campus context related to academic integrity and outlines recommended next steps for the institution.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this project, the following definitions were used:

**Academic Integrity (general)** - A commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, respect, trust, fairness, and responsibility. From these five values evolve principles of behavior that enable academic communities to translate ideas into action. (The Center for Academic Integrity, 1999, p.4)

**Lehigh University Academic Integrity (excerpted from the Lehigh University Student Handbook)** - Lehigh University expects that all students will act in a manner that reflects personal and intellectual honesty.

Proscribed Conduct

A. Cheating. This includes but is not limited to:
1. The use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations.
   i. The possession at any quiz or examination of any articles which are prohibited will be regarded as evidence of responsibility.
2. The dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports or homework, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments.
3. The acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the university faculty or staff.
4. Any attempt to falsify an assigned grade in an examination, quiz, report, program, grade book, or any other record or document.
5. The creation and/or submission of falsified data in any experiment, research paper, laboratory assignment, or other assignment.
6. Collusion occurs when students willfully give or receive unauthorized or unacknowledged assistance. Both parties to the collusion are considered responsible.

B. Plagiarism. This includes but is not limited to:
1. The direct use or paraphrase, of the work, themes or ideas, of another person without full and clear acknowledgement.
2. Submitting the work of another as your own in any assignment (including papers, tests, labs, homework, computer assignments, or any other work that is evaluated by the instructor).

**Academic Dishonesty -**

While academic dishonesty can appear in all learning settings from grade school through graduate school, the phrase academic dishonesty will be used in this project in the context of higher education. This project will use the definition that Gehring and Pavela provided in a 1994 report to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA):

Academic dishonesty is an intentional act of fraud, in which a person seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in an academic exercise. (Gehring & Pavela, 1994, p. 5)
Honor Code -

To be considered an honor code institution, a school must have at least two characteristics and elements of a third characteristic from the following list: un-proctored exams, use of a written pledge in which students affirm that they have not cheated on particular work, a hearing body in which students play a major role, and an expectation that students should report any violations of the honor code they observe (McCabe, Butterfield & Trevino, 2012, p.91)

National Context and Related Research

Why should educators be so concerned with academic integrity? Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) provide eight reasons why academic integrity is an essential part of the fabric of educational settings.

1. Equity- students who cheat may receive better grades than they deserve and affect the evaluation of honest students’ work.

2. Character and development – moral and ethical development is part of a university’s core mission.

3. Mission to transfer knowledge – universities exist to preserve, search for, and transfer knowledge to society.

4. Faculty morale – when cheating occurs in the academy faculty members can feel personally affronted, angry, frustrated and even cynical.

5. Student morale – when honest students see their peers cheat and experience no consequences, they become frustrated.
6. Students’ future behavior – if students cheat in high school and college, then it is quite plausible they will engage in dishonest practices in their careers.

7. Reputation of institution - when cheating scandals occur at institutions, the name of the school can become linked with the notion that academic dishonesty is pervasive, and their reputations may suffer.

8. Public confidence in higher education – incidents of cheating in the media may lead to a loss of faith in and financial support for universities.

Academic integrity in higher education institutions has been the subject of national and international studies for decades (Aaron & Georgia, 1994; Bowers, 1964; Drinan, 1999; Kibler, 1993a; McCabe, 1992, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Nuss, 1984; Saddlemire, 2005). College student academic dishonesty occurs across the country and around the world. In the United States cheating by college students has been documented as widespread for a long time and the trends have remained fairly consistent over the past forty years. Bowers (1964) found that 75% of over 5,000 students surveyed at 99 colleges and universities admitted to one or more incidents of classroom cheating. Nearly thirty years later, McCabe and Trevino (1993) found that 67% of 6,000 college students surveyed admitted to one or more incidents of classroom cheating. In a 1999 meta-analysis of academic integrity, Hendershott and Drinan concluded that 70% of college students self-reported that they cheated on a test or examination.
Nationally, it is difficult to determine how many students are caught cheating, but estimates range from 3% (Wright & Kelly, 1974; Singhal, 1982) to 7% (Bunn, Caudill, & Gropper, 1992) annually. Institutional statistics about the number of cases reported for adjudication have been noted by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Auer & Krupar, 2001), Rutgers University (Fishbein, 1993), Kansas State University (Marcoux, 2002), and the University of Maryland (McCabe & Pavela, 1998). All these statistics point to a large gap between the high frequency of student self-reported cheating and the low frequency of reported cases. The Center for Academic Integrity (2000) lists four main reasons for differences in self-reported cheating rates and university student conduct statistics. First, there are cases of dishonesty that go unnoticed or undetected. Second, students do not report each other. Third, faculty members may prefer to ignore cheating. Fourth, faculty members may decide to address the incidents informally and not report them to the student conduct offices.

Campuses with clear administrative systems in place that are supported by faculty may see more reports of academic dishonesty by instructors (Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnik, Whitley, & Washburn, 1998; McCabe & Pavela, 1998). As faculty become more aware of the processes and also approve of the procedures and sanctions, they are more likely to report cases of cheating they observe (Fishbein, 1993; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Marcoux, 2002; McCabe, 2007).

The prevalence of academic dishonesty has also been studied in high schools. Donald McCabe, a renowned scholar and researcher of academic integrity issues, conducted a study in 2001 focusing on high school students in grades 9 through 12. He surveyed 4,500 students from 25 high schools (private and public), with the
majority of respondents in the eleventh grade. Results of this study indicated that 97 percent of respondents reported performing at least one questionable act such as copying a homework assignment or test. Seventy-four percent reported participating in one or more instances of serious test cheating (McCabe, 2001).

A search of the LexisNexis Academic database yields numerous news articles published internationally about struggles overseas to control and manage the disturbing presence of significant high school and college cheating (Chinadaily.com.cn 2010; The Toronto Sun, 2010; Korea Times, 2005; The London Times, 2010; The Australian Financial Review, 2006). China, Korea, and Canada all have reported problems with the high rate of academic dishonesty which may indicate there is nothing unique about the American system of education, or American college students, that makes us unusually disposed to academic dishonesty.

A review of the literature indicates that most previous studies focused on undergraduate students, the reasons they cheat, their self-reported frequency of cheating, attitudes and perceptions about academic integrity, and what they define as serious academic dishonesty. By comparison, less research explored faculty beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors about academic integrity. By investigating faculty members’ attitudes, experiences, understandings and behaviors related to academic dishonesty, campuses may be able to make progress in reducing cheating and creating campus cultures of integrity.

**College Student Experiences and Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty**

Are colleges “growing” cheating behaviors in students or “inheriting” them? In a 2012 study surveying 23,000 high school students, The Josephson Institute reported that 51 percent admitted to cheating on a test during the past year, compared
to 64 percent in 2008. Among the college population, surveys conducted by McCabe between 2002 and 2010 of more than 70,000 undergraduates discovered that 65 percent admitted cheating. It seems that there may be a bit of both phenomena present – growing and inheriting students that exhibit cheating behaviors.

Some variables have consistently been associated with higher levels of cheating in the college setting. For example, Kibler (1993a) reviewed the literature examining academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. In his review, Kibler (1993a) cited studies that examined personal characteristics of cheaters including the relationship between college grades and cheating, the relationship between fraternity or sorority membership and cheating, and the relationship between gender and cheating. Ellenburg (1973) found that approximately half of the cheaters in his study had grade averages below 85. Vitro (1971), as cited in Kibler (1993a), reported that cheating was more prevalent among students with low grade averages. In addition, Kibler (1993) cited a study done by Drake (1941) who found that 16% of nonmembers of fraternities or sororities cheated, whereas 36% of fraternity or sorority members cheated. Bonjean and McGee (1965) wrote that fraternity and sorority membership was the personal characteristic most commonly associated with cheating. Williams and Janosik (2007) also noted students with Greek organization affiliation are more likely to self-report cheating than non-Greek affiliated college students.

Similarly, a few variables are consistently associated with lower rates of cheating. McCabe and Trevino (1993) found lower levels of cheating among institutions with honor codes. This may indicate that the overall campus environment somehow discourages cheating at honor code schools, or students who choose to attend honor code schools may be less likely to cheat. McCabe and Trevino (1996)
postulate that peer disapproval is a powerful deterrent to cheating in college. In their 1990-1991 study, McCabe/Trevino discovered that 53% students attending colleges that did not have honor codes self-reported one or more instances of cheating on tests, compared with 29% of students at honor code schools. These findings suggest that campus climate may be an important determinant of the level of student cheating on a campus, but that even honor code schools are not free of cheating incidents. Selective admissions, smaller enrollments, and a high percentage of students living on campus are also associated with lower levels of cheating (McCabe and Trevino, 1983).

**College Faculty Experiences and Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty**

In order to improve a campus climate of integrity, it is essential to gain an understanding of academic dishonesty from the perspectives of the faculty at the institution. Researchers have pointed out that faculty members can play a crucial role in reducing incidents of cheating and subsequently contribute to a campus culture of integrity (Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Selingo, 2004). Kibler (1993), McCabe and Trevino (2007), and Pavela (1997) concluded that students are more likely to cheat when they believe that faculty members will not report the incidents. That finding becomes magnified when juxtaposed against the research of McCabe (1993a) who found one in three faculty members admitted they knew students were cheating in their classes and chose not to report the behavior. Why don’t these faculty members report cheating when they observe it? Some findings point to emotional consequences, anxiety about teaching evaluations, perceived lack of administrative support, the amount of time it takes to resolve the case through the judicial process, and a fear of litigation (Jendrek, 1989; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff 2007). Others have found that faculty ignore cheating
because they lack a clear understanding of what is acceptable (Higbee & Thomas, 2002); they don’t believe it is a serious problem (Cizek, 1999); or they are concerned with the level of proof required and the fairness of the process (Coalter, Lim, & Wanorie, 2007).

Jendrek (1989) noted that faculty reactions to academic dishonesty rarely serve as the focus of research. She also noted that faculty attitudes towards cheating do have a significant influence on the extent to which academic dishonesty policies and processes are utilized and are effective on campuses. She surveyed full time faculty members at a large Midwestern university to better understand their experiences.

In that study, Jendrek (1989) found that 60% of the faculty respondents reportedly witnessed cheating on exams. Of these faculty members who reported witnessing cheating, 67% discussed the incident with the student, and 33% reported the incident to the department chair. Twenty percent met with the student and the department chair (complying with university policy). Only 8% of the faculty members reported the cheating to the dean, and 5% informed the provost. Eight percent of the faculty who witnessed cheating on an exam said that they ignored the incident. Similarly, Aaron and Georgia (1994) found that 60% of faculty members were likely to take decisions regarding academic dishonesty into their own hands rather than use established administrative reporting procedures. The findings of Wright and Kelly (1974), Jendrek (1989), Nuss (1984), and Singhal (1992) also reveal that most faculty members prefer to handle cheating directly with the student, bypassing established university procedures.

Jendrek (1989) discussed the possible implications when faculty members bypass university policy and handle alleged cheating incidents on their own: (a)
Wright and Kelly (1974) surveyed 108 faculty members and 257 students in introductory psychology and science courses at a medium-size, private, liberal arts college and concluded that faculty and students generally agreed on what constituted cheating. Twice as many students (42%) as faculty (22%) reported observing an occurrence of cheating on exams. Thirty nine percent of the student respondents observed incidents of plagiarism compared to 22% of the faculty that reported encountering plagiarism. Interestingly, Wright and Kelly (1974) noted that many faculty members seemed willing to accept some responsibility for the cheating problem since 43 % of faculty respondents believed they could do more in their classroom to prevent cheating. One explanation for the discrepancy between student and faculty reports of cheating frequency is that faculty members tend to ignore academic dishonesty policy and prefer to handle situations one on one with the student who allegedly cheated (Jendrek, 1989). Another likely explanation is that students speak with each other more frequently and report that they “see” more cheating because they hear about it in conversations with peers.

Wright and Kelly (1974) reported that faculty considered cheating a matter to be settled between the instructor and the student; only 15 % of the 108 faculty respondents said they had reported a student suspected of cheating to the administration. Similarly, Singhal (1982) surveyed 364 engineering students and 80 faculty members at a western American university regarding cheating on their campus. Faculty respondents were also asked to take a brief quiz entitled “How Conscious of
Cheating are You?” which asked questions about faculty classroom procedures regarding cheating prevention. In this study, Singhal (1982) found that 56% of the students admitted to cheating in some form, whereas only 3% admitted to having been caught. In addition, Singhal (1982) reported that 65% of the faculty surveyed stated that they caught students cheating, even though only 21% of these same faculty reported any cheating occurrences to the administration. In addition, only 57% of the faculty reported that they covered the topic of cheating in their course.

Nuss (1984) conducted two studies to examine and compare faculty and student attitudes about academic integrity. The first study focused on 146 college students enrolled at a large public institution. The students completed a survey designed to elicit information about the seriousness with which college students view different forms of cheating behavior, the reasons why students cheat, and what students do when they observe cheating incidents. The second study focused on 169 faculty members from the same college who responded to the same survey. Nuss (1984) discovered that both faculty and students agreed on the five least serious cheating behaviors, and also agreed on four of the five most serious cheating behaviors. Similar agreement between faculty and students occurred when they were asked their opinions about why students cheat. Forty-five percent of students and 37% of faculty reported that cheating occurred to avoid failing a class. Twenty one percent of students and 23% of faculty believed the reason students cheat is because no one ever gets punished for such behavior. With respect to reporting of cheating, Nuss (1984) found faculty reluctant to report students caught cheating in their classrooms. Only 39% of faculty surveyed indicated they would report a case of cheating to the administration. However, only 1% indicated they would ignore the
matter altogether, which demonstrates a strong tendency for faculty to deal with the cheating incident on their own.

**College Administrators’ Experiences and Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty**

Aaron and Georgia (1994) examined how administrators assess their faculty, student, and institutional responses to academic dishonesty. They surveyed student affairs administrators at private and public universities as well as community colleges. Responses were received from chief student affairs officers (38.7%), associate or assistant deans of students (29.1%), judicial officers (9.7%), chief academic officers (4%), associate or assistant academic affairs officers (14.9%), and other administrative personnel (4.6%). When comparing the responses of student affairs administrators and academic affairs administrators, Aaron and Georgia (1994) found some different perceptions. More student affairs administrators (66.7%) than academic affairs administrators (43.7%) believed faculty members handle cheating on their own and ignore established procedures. The authors found that 60% of respondents believed that faculty members at their institutions were likely to “take decisions regarding student academic integrity into their own hands without utilizing established procedural guidelines” (Aaron and Georgia, 1994, p.85).

**Institutional Factors that Impact Academic Integrity**

While academic dishonesty can be defined as a set of behaviors that an individual exhibits, there is also a community context that can influence the prevalence of cheating at an institution. The literature demonstrates that the culture on a college campus significantly influences the amount of cheating that occurs. Gallant and Drinan (2006) note that universities focus most of their attention on policing and
punishing academic dishonesty rather than promoting, educating and developing values of academic integrity. McCabe (1993b) states, “The highest predictor we have for academic dishonesty is when students perceive that cheating is socially acceptable at the institutions they’re attending” (p. 342). McCabe and Trevino (1997) conducted a study that showed some major contextual factors that influence academic dishonesty on campus are peers’ cheating behavior, peers’ disapproval of cheating, students’ perceptions of the culture of academic integrity on campus, and the perceived severity of penalties for cheating. Nonis and Swift (1998) also found that students who believe the institution takes a strong stance to reinforce academic integrity by sanctioning those who cheat are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty. Faculty and administrators can potentially influence these contextual factors.

**Faculty Role in Shaping Campus Environment**

A campus culture that openly and symbolically values integrity is essential to achieve a sustainable climate of academic integrity with less cheating. Faculty members play a crucial role in fostering an environment of integrity and have the ability to reduce the frequency of cheating on a campus. McCabe and Pavela (1997, 2004) list the following ten standards or principles of academic integrity for faculty.

1. Recognize and affirm academic integrity as a core institutional value.
2. Foster a lifelong commitment to learning.
3. Affirm the role of teacher as guide and mentor.
4. Help students understand the potential of the Internet and how potential can be lost if online resources are used for fraud, theft, and deception.
5. Encourage student responsibility for academic integrity.
6. Clarify expectations for students.
7. Develop fair and creative forms of assessment.
8. Reduce opportunities to engage in academic dishonesty.
9. Respond to academic dishonesty when it occurs.
10. Help define and support campus-wide academic integrity standards.

One can imagine that if faculty embrace these ten recommendations, cheating may be less likely to occur in their classrooms and on campus.

**Administrator Role in Influencing Campus Culture**

College administrators can assist in creating a campus culture that values integrity. In his article “It Takes a Village: Academic Dishonesty and Educational Opportunity,” Donald McCabe discusses the tendency for faculty, administrators and students to blame each other for academic dishonesty on campus (McCabe 2005). Many faculty believe that the campus policies are unduly litigious and filled with red tape. Since administrators have significant responsibilities for oversight of policies and enforcement, this could be one area where administrators can make some progress. Administrators could seek to understand the faculty members’ beliefs and perceptions about the campus conduct process. Are faculty members reporting cheating incidents? If not, why not?

In addition, administrators can alter campus culture in other ways beyond catching cheaters and enforcing sanctions. Given the importance of peer influence, administrators can work towards establishing values and educating students about ethical behavior.
**Honor Codes**

One approach to addressing academic dishonesty is the establishment of an honor code. In some studies, honor code campuses report lower levels of cheating compared to non-honor code campuses (McCabe & Pavela, 2005). Honor codes attempt to create a culture that values integrity, reinforces individual responsibility, creates a sense of community values, and includes clearly defined academic integrity policies and consistent application of sanctions. Most honor code systems include a signed academic integrity pledge by students obligating them to refrain from cheating and report any cheating by others. In addition, faculty members rarely proctor exams at honor code institutions, and students play a primary role in the adjudication of their peers’ violations. Frequently, honor code schools are characterized by a “zero tolerance” sanction approach. If a student is found responsible for violating the code, they most likely will be expelled. The presence of an honor code does not mitigate all cheating on campus, but there does appear to be fewer self-reported cheating incidents. The Center for Academic Integrity conducted a study in 2000 that reported 23% of students at honor code schools admitted to one or more incident of cheating on a test or examination in the previous year. The University of Virginia and the United States Naval Academy, both honor code institutions with single sanctions of expulsion, had incidents involving multiple students expelled for cheating. In 2001, 45 students at the University of Virginia were expelled for plagiarism on a physics research paper assignment. In 1992, when 134 midshipmen at the U. S. Naval Academy were implicated in a cheating scandal involving a stolen exam, 24 of those students were expelled. More recently a mass cheating scandal at Harvard University in spring 2012 involved 125 students who inappropriately collaborated on a take home
final exam. Harvard does not currently have an honor code in place, but this recent occurrence has prompted its leaders to consider creating an honor code.

**Modified Honor Codes**

In 1990, the University of Maryland developed a “modified honor code” and several other schools have adopted modified honor codes in the past twenty years. Modified honor codes differ from traditional honor codes in that un-proctored exams are used only at the faculty member’s discretion and students are not always expected to report cheating by others. In addition, the “zero tolerance” sanction approach is not characteristic of modified honor codes. Rather, educational sanctions are the focus of the conduct process, although in appropriate circumstances students may be expelled for cheating if it is warranted. The common traits of traditional and modified honor codes include some type of honor pledge and student involvement in the disciplinary process, such as a hearing panel. Modified honor codes, similar to traditional honor codes, are characterized by significant student adjudication of cheating allegations and the promotion and marketing of the campus climate of integrity. The Center for Academic Integrity study conducted in 2000 found that at modified honor code schools, 33% of students reported they cheated on a test or exam in the previous year compared to the 23% at honor code schools. While modified honor code schools had more self-reported cheating than honor code schools, both rates were still significantly lower than the 45% of students who reported cheating at non-honor code schools.

**No Honor Codes**

Schools without honor codes usually have a traditional administrative academic integrity policy where faculty and students report instances of suspected
academic dishonesty to student affairs administrators. The administrative student conduct processes on such campuses vary, but they typically employ several options for resolving the cases including formal discipline hearings with panels or an individual administrator doling out the sanctions. There is usually a variety of sanctions rather than a zero tolerance single sanction of expulsion. Unlike the honor code and modified honor code systems, students and faculty members make no explicit pledge to refrain from cheating or report instances they observe. Schools with no honor code may impose strict sanctions for academic dishonesty such as suspension, but the overriding priority is student education. Students at schools with no honor code report they engage in more cheating than their counterparts at honor code and modified honor code schools.

McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) studied honor code and non-honor code colleges and found that campuses where honor codes were in place for a short period of time reported lower levels of cheating than colleges with no honor code. McCabe et al. (1999) also found that students at honor code institutions believed they would be caught and that the sanctions would be severe, resulting in less cheating. Students at honor code institutions perceive academic integrity in a fundamentally different way compared to students at non-honor code schools. McCabe and Pavela (2005) indicate that significantly less cheating at honor code schools is not a reflection solely of a fear of being caught. They assert that a more important factor is the peer culture that develops on honor code campuses that makes cheating seem to be a socially unacceptable behavior among most students. One implication is that deliberate efforts to enhance the core value of integrity may reduce cheating on campuses.
McCabe and Trevino (2007) acknowledge that non-honor code schools have demonstrated reduced cheating when they clearly communicate a campus commitment to academic integrity and make it an active topic of discussion among students and faculty. At schools with modified honor codes instructors have the option to administer exams without proctors and students are encouraged but not required to report cheating they observe.

**Academic Integrity at Lehigh University**

Lehigh University Description

Founded in 1865, Lehigh University is a co-educational, nondenominational, private, highly selective, residential university in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The Spring 2014 full time equivalent undergraduate student population is 4,777 and the headcount is 4,883. The full time equivalent graduate population of 1,537 and the headcount is 2,044. The new undergraduate students entering the University in the Fall 2013 represented all 50 states and 58 foreign countries. The race and ethnicity of the Spring 2014 undergraduate population includes 68.5% White, 8.2% Hispanic, 6.9% Asian, 7.1% Non-Resident Alien, 3.4% Black or African American, 0.06% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2.7% Multi-racial, and 3.2% Race and Ethnicity unknown. The undergraduate population is comprised of 55.9% males and 44.1% females.

The median SAT score for matriculated students is 1330, and the mean SAT score is 1319. Undergraduate enrollment by college is as follows: Arts and Sciences 1,664 students, P.C. Rossin Engineering and Applied Sciences 1,760 students, Business and Economics 1,199 students, Arts Engineering 42 students, Intercollegiate
Programs 147 students, and General College Division 21 students. The first to second year retention rate for the class entering Fall 2012 is 93.9%. The six year graduation rate for the cohort entering Fall 2007 is 85.8%.

More than 50% of Lehigh University undergraduates receive some form of financial aid. Nearly 38% of undergraduate students are affiliated with fraternities and sororities and 14.5% of undergraduates are affiliated with a division I athletic team. The undergraduate population is largely traditional college age and all first and second year students are required to live on campus. In total, 73% of all undergraduate students reside on campus. For the 2013-2014 academic year, undergraduate tuition, room, and board was $54,780.

The student to faculty ratio is 10:1. There are 501 faculty at Lehigh University: full professor (196), associate professor (136) assistant professor (110), lecturer (7), professor of practice (42), and visiting faculty (10). Three hundred and forty eight of the faculty are male and 153 are female. Sixty five percent of the faculty are tenured and 11.8% of the faculty are not on tenure-track (Lehigh University Office of Institutional Research census).

Lehigh University Code of Conduct

Colleges and universities almost uniformly have a student handbook which serves as the contractual relationship between the student and the institution. A student code of conduct is usually included in a typical student handbook. The code of conduct articulates the expected behaviors of the student community and serves as the compass for the university’s ethos. Included in nearly every college and university code of conduct are expectations about academic integrity.
The Lehigh University’s Code of Conduct is a prominent section of the Student Handbook. The preamble to the Code of Conduct emphasizes the value of academic integrity:

“The Office of Student Conduct is charged with maintaining behavioral standards for student members of the Lehigh University Community. Through fundamentally fair processes, we strive to promote a healthy, safe campus community and to provide a means to resolve behavioral issues that is educational in nature.

Lehigh University’s philosophy on student conduct is as follows: “Intellectual honesty and mutual respect are not accidental values in a university. They are, for students and professors alike, a presupposition of that pursuit of truth, which brings universities into existence in the first place. It is essential that an academic community uphold these values through rules designed to protect the freedom to teach and learn.

The Office of Student Conduct and the student judicial system are mechanisms by which the university endeavors to develop in all students a sense of responsibility to the Lehigh University community. When students fail to act in accord with the rules and regulations of the community, the university must hold them accountable for their actions. Our purpose is not solely to punish students for transgressions, but to help them understand and accept their obligations as citizens of this academic community. The primary document governing student behavior is the University Code of Student Conduct which is required reading for all students.”

(2014 Lehigh University Student Handbook)

Gary Pavela (1977) developed a “Model Code of Academic Integrity” that defines four distinct components of academic dishonesty: cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, and facilitating academic dishonesty. These four components can be found in the Lehigh University Code of Conduct. The Lehigh University Student Code of Conduct identifies the community expectation of academic integrity as one of its six foundational behavioral tenets.

The Code of Conduct defines academic integrity as follows:

Lehigh University expects that all students will act in a manner that reflects personal and intellectual honesty.

Proscribed Conduct:
A. Cheating. This includes but is not limited to:

1. The use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations.
   
i. The possession at any quiz or examination of any articles which are prohibited will be regarded as evidence of responsibility.

2. The dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports or homework, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments.

3. The acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the university faculty or staff.

4. Any attempt to falsify an assigned grade in an examination, quiz, report, program, grade book, or any other record or document.

5. The creation and/or submission of falsified data in any experiment, research paper, laboratory assignment, or other assignment.

6. Collusion occurs when students willfully give or receive unauthorized or unacknowledged assistance. Both parties to the collusion are considered responsible.

B. Plagiarism. This includes but is not limited to:

1. The direct use or paraphrase, of the work, themes or ideas, of another person without full and clear acknowledgement.

2. Submitting the work of another as your own in any assignment (including papers, tests, labs, homework, computer assignments, or any other work that is evaluated by the instructor).

If a student fails to abide by the expectations listed above the Code of Conduct states that the incident is to be reported to the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations for resolution. It is the conduct officer’s responsibility to investigate the allegation of academic dishonesty and determine if there is enough information to bring charges against a student or student organization for alleged violations of the Code.
The Code stipulates that accused students have the right to have all alleged academic integrity violations heard by the University Committee on Discipline (UCOD), a hearing panel comprised of two faculty, two students, and one administrator. During a formal UCOD hearing, the faculty member of the course in which the student allegedly cheated is called into the hearing as a witness, but is not present for the entire hearing.

If students prefer not to have their case heard by the UCOD panel, and they accept responsibility for the violation, they can request to have their case adjudicated via an Academic Integrity Conference. An Academic Integrity Conference Panel consists of the conduct officer, one faculty representative from UCOD, and one student representative from UCOD. The accused student and the course instructor involved may be in attendance during the entire conference.

If students are found responsible for an academic integrity violation of the Code of Conduct, they will receive one of five possible primary sanctions: disciplinary warning, disciplinary probation, deferred suspension, suspension, or expulsion. In addition to receiving one of these primary sanctions, students may also receive additional sanctions including withholding of their degree, revocation of their degree if already conferred, the grade of “F” in the course, recommendations to the faculty to reduce the final course grade, and educational sanctions including writing of a paper.

Personal Context

The Lehigh University Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations is in the student affairs administrative stem. I have been a professional staff member in the Lehigh University division of student affairs since 1989, and since 1999 I have served as the Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students. In my current
role, I supervise the Associate Dean of Students who, in turn, supervises the Assistant Dean for Student Conduct and Community Expectations (conduct officer). Earlier in my Lehigh University career, I also served as the direct supervisor of the University’s conduct officer for three years and prior to that I was the University’s conduct officer for four years.

As conduct officer, I administered the system for student discipline, including the policies and procedures related to academic dishonesty cases. I observed the following characteristics that I believe contribute to a campus climate that could be improved as it relates to valuing academic integrity: lack of campus dialog and engagement about the issue, lack of campus awareness of the scope and magnitude of the issue, an unwritten code of students not confronting each other’s unethical behaviors, and many faculty members not complying with the Code of Conduct’s requirement to report suspected cases.

For example, throughout my involvement with student conduct at Lehigh University I was acutely aware of the discrepancy between how frequently students acknowledged cheating was occurring and how infrequently faculty members reported cases of cheating. This dissonance intrigued me and I was compelled to learn more about the circumstances at Lehigh University that might explain this disconnect, and also lead to an improvement in the campus climate related to academic integrity.

In addition to the gap between suspected amounts of student cheating and less frequently reported cases to the student conduct office, anecdotal reports by Lehigh University students and faculty indicate that some faculty members do not report alleged cases of academic dishonesty through the procedures outlined in the student handbook. My experience tells me that some faculty members choose to levy grade
penalties on students they accuse of cheating, independently, without following the documented reporting procedures approved by the faculty and detailed in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty.

When faculty members do not report cases of academic dishonesty for adjudication by the University Committee on Discipline several concerns are raised. First, if a faculty member catches a student cheating and chooses to handle the situation without reporting the incident to the conduct office, they have no way of knowing if that particular student was reported for cheating in a previous class. In addition, when the faculty member doesn’t report the incident, there is no formal record created in the conduct office, which is where all student disciplinary records are kept. These are critical issues given that consideration of any prior violations is an important variable when levying sanctions to students who violate the Code of Conduct. Second, when a faculty member independently determines that a student is guilty of cheating, the student is denied due process rights to a fair hearing as outlined in the Lehigh University Student Handbook. In addition, the student has a right to request an appeal of a formal hearing, and this appeal process is not available if the faculty member handles the incident without formally reporting it to the judicial officer. Third, faculty members who independently resolve academic dishonesty allegations leave themselves vulnerable to student complaints and potential civil litigation since they did not follow the established university procedures for reporting academic dishonesty violations. Fourth, when faculty members independently invoke grade penalties for alleged cases of academic dishonesty, there is no way to insure consistency and fairness in the treatment of students across the university. Finally, the fact that some faculty do not officially report academic dishonesty cases may
contribute to a campus climate which does not view cheating as a problem, further exacerbating the incidence of cheating on campus.

In my professional roles, I have spent considerable time demystifying legends that faculty members would share with me and each other. For example, a few years ago, a tenured faculty member in the English department asked me to attend her department faculty meeting to speak about the student conduct process. She said there was significant hesitancy on the part of the English department faculty to report cases of suspected cheating to the conduct officer because the previous year an English department faculty member reported a “minor” case (student failing to cite a direct quote in a non-research paper) and the student was expelled. The English department faculty believed that punishment was too severe. I conveyed that there had not been any Lehigh University students expelled for plagiarism in the past 7 years. Furthermore, I shared that since I arrived at Lehigh University in 1989 there had been no student(s) expelled for plagiarism that resulted from a case reported by the English department. During my meeting with the department faculty, they were stunned to hear that the legend of the allegedly expelled student was not accurate, and when they spoke about it as a group, they realized that none of them knew who the alleged faculty member was that supposedly reported the fictitious case. Challenging that lore allowed us to then have a very productive discussion about the process and potential outcomes for academic dishonesty conduct cases. This was a critical collaboration to form because that department evaluates a significant amount of students’ written work.

In addition to anecdotal stories I heard as the conduct officer, I became aware of numerous situations in which faculty members failed to use the established
procedures to report cheating and instead decided to handle the incidents on their own. One illustration of this under-reporting problem occurred when a faculty member teaching a computer science course in the engineering college suspected that thirty six of his students had crossed the line of collaboration on a programming assignment and, in his opinion, had copied their assignments from each other. That faculty member did not report the case to the Dean of Students Office conduct officer. Rather, the faculty member asked each of the 36 students to sign a document admitting that they had cheated in exchange for a lowered grade on the assignment. This document also indicated that the student would not be brought forward on formal university charges of academic dishonesty if he/she signed it and admitted to cheating. In addition to this unilateral action, the faculty member then spent some time in the class discussing cheating. In a subsequent assignment, the faculty member again suspected that eleven students had cheated in much the same manner as the first cheating incident. At this point, the faculty member brought forward these eleven individuals to the conduct officer to proceed with formal charges.

As conduct officer, I then faced a complex issue. The faculty member’s decision not to officially report the first thirty six students raised questions of equitable treatment for the newly accused eleven students. This second group of eleven students was not offered the same “deal” to admit guilt and have their assignment grades lowered. Also, this did not allow for differential treatment of repeat offenders. If the cases had gone through the stipulated conduct processes, one possible outcome could have been more severe consequences than the first group of students received initially. Also, if any of these eleven students were among the group that had cheated before, we were not able to consider this in the sanctioning phase of the hearing. The eleven
students were found responsible by a University Committee on Discipline and placed on probation. The committee also recommended the faculty member assign a grade of F to their projects. The university conduct process provides an appeal option but none of the eleven students appealed the decisions. However, this highlights another inequity in the professor’s handling of the thirty six students because they were not provided an appeal mechanism because he handled their cases himself. That is a fundamental violation of their due process rights as outlined in the Student Handbook’s Code of Conduct.

Yet another issue arises when a faculty member does not report cheating as outlined in the Code – it is a breach of the university’s implied “contract” with students. The Student Handbook is the university’s contract with students and violating the procedures outlined therein could leave the university vulnerable in the event of litigation. As conduct officer I spoke with the faculty member and discussed all of those concerns. I also explained that if students decided to pursue legal or civil recourse in such instances that the university could potentially refuse to provide legal counsel since the faculty member had violated the university’s stated rules and regulations. He explained some of the factors that led him to handle the first round of cheating on his own including a fear that students would be treated too harshly in the conduct system. The dialogue was mutually beneficial and we developed a consultative relationship for the ensuing years. In addition, I recruited this faculty member to serve many years on the University Committee on Discipline and he became one of our most effective hearing panel members.

In addition to incidents of faculty under-reporting, there were occasions when students would seek advice from me because their grades were lowered by faculty
members who accused them of cheating without due process. These students were never given an opportunity to respond to the allegations and have their side of the story considered in the manner outlined in the Code of Conduct. These instances prompted me to first gain a deeper understanding of the faculty perspective on and experience of cheating and its adjudication.

Pilot Study

While enrolled in the University of Delaware’s doctoral program in educational leadership, I conducted a pilot study as part of the Qualitative Research and Evaluation Designs course. The pilot study consisted of an in depth interview with a Lehigh University faculty member to assist me in framing my research questions and gaining an understanding of academic dishonesty from a faculty member’s viewpoint.

During the interview with a Lehigh faculty member, I asked him a variety of questions about his experiences with student cheating at Lehigh. The professor detailed different incidents of cheating he had encountered and described his responses to these incidents. In one instance the faculty member punished two students he suspected of cheating without reporting the case to the Conduct Office. He met with the two students, who denied cheating, but he failed them for the paper and then discussed cheating with the entire class, using the incident as an opportunity to establish expectations. I wondered what decision making process the faculty member used when determining how he would proceed, so I asked him if he recalled what influenced his decision to handle the cheating incident by himself. He responded, “That’s a good question. I wanted to make sure that that cheating was not widespread in the class, so rather than treat it as a strictly confidential incident that would not be
discussed with any other class members, I chose to deal with it as a pedagogical question - as a general question, rather than the specific instance of cheating. I took it to be a norm failure, that I had not established the norms appropriately for non-cheating, and therefore it was my job to straighten that out publicly with the students, rather than to pursue a cheating incident because I had not set the proper climate or norms for that kind of behavior. So I took it upon myself to rectify it, rather than to go the academic dishonesty route.”

This interview also explored another important topic: the faculty member’s understanding of Lehigh University policies and procedures regarding academic dishonesty. The faculty member was not aware of the language in the Code of Conduct that defined academic dishonesty. He also was not aware of the stated procedure and expectation that all suspected incidents of cheating be reported to the Conduct Office. Furthermore, this faculty member teaches mostly graduate classes and graduate students, and he explained that he has less tolerance for graduate students who cheat. He also explained that he would hesitate to report cases to be handled by the Conduct Office because if there was not enough proof, the student would get off “scott-free” when he knew that they in fact did cheat.

This faculty interview, in conjunction with my own professional experiences as a university judicial officer, informed this research in a number of ways. It became clear to me that I needed to examine individual faculty members’ decision making processes as well as collect group data. Studying a larger group of faculty members shed light on faculty’s behaviors and beliefs regarding reporting of cheating incidents.
Measures of the Lehigh University Academic Integrity Climate

A major determinant of whether a student will cheat or not is the academic culture of the institution he/she attends (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). In a campus culture where academic integrity is not valued symbolically or behaviorally, cheating can become socially acceptable and ignored. From an organizational view, I believe that the most impactful way to alter cheating behaviors is to improve the entire campus ethos related to academic integrity. I believe this approach is much more comprehensive, sustainable, and desirable rather than just focusing on catching cheating students and levying consequences. Enforcement of policy is certainly a part of campus culture, but it is only one part of the picture. To chart the course of where I wanted the Lehigh University culture to go, I first needed to get a sense of the campus climate was in 2003 with respect to academic integrity.

Drinan Typology

Just as individuals move through stages of cognitive and moral development, colleges and universities move through stages of institutional development as it relates to academic integrity (Drinan, 2003). Patrick Drinan created a developmental framework for universities to assist in understanding their campus climate related to academic integrity. Drinan’s typology describes four stages: “primitive”, “radar screen”, “mature”, and “honor code”. He postulates that institutions move from a complete lack of written policies and great variability in how faculty and administrators confront cheating to a culture where students assume primary responsibility in implementing and supporting an effective and widely accepted academic integrity policy.
Drinan’s typology helped me to describe Lehigh University and allowed me to measure progress from 2003 to 2014. Drinan’s four stages are:

Stage one: “Primitive”
This stage describes a school with no policy or procedures (or minimal ones) and where there is great variation in faculty and administrative handling of cheating.

Stage two: “Radar screen”
This stage describes a school where cheating issues have risen to public debate because of the perceived weakness of academic integrity policies and fundamental concerns with the consistency and fairness of existing practices. Stage two is characterized by early efforts, usually led by administrators, to put policy and procedures into effect, often for fear of litigation.

Stage three: “Mature”
This stage characterizes a school where academic integrity policies and procedures are known and widely, but not universally, supported. Continuing efforts occur to socialize new faculty and students to the academic integrity policy, and it is used frequently by faculty, in particular.

Stage four: “Honor code”
This stage describes an institution where students take a major responsibility in implementing the integrity policy, and there is wide recognition that the code distinguishes the school while leading to lower cheating and plagiarism rates than most non-code schools.

In 2003, at the beginning of this project, I estimate Lehigh University was somewhere in-between “primitive” and the “radar screen” stages in Drinan’s typology. The University did have established procedures and policies, yet there was wide variation in handling of incidents. There were also some administrative efforts to address academic dishonesty issues. I set the goal for Lehigh University to be in stage three, “mature”, following implementation of recommendations made throughout this work. I believed this goal was attainable and could imagine a future when academic
integrity policies were known and supported on campus. I believe that stage three, “mature”, is the most desirable and sustainable stage for Lehigh University.

Stage four in Drinan’s Typology is entitled “honor code” and is descriptive of institutions where students play a significant role in implementation of policy, and the presence of a code is attributed with contributing to lower cheating levels compared to schools with no honor code. In 2003, Lehigh University did not have any form of honor code present and we were extremely distant from Drinan’s stage four category. The student Code of Conduct, which covered multiple behavioral expectations including but not limited to academic integrity, was in place. But the Code of Conduct did not have any of the characteristics associated with an honor code (expectation to report others, presence of an honor pledge, single sanction for violators, etc.).

Academic Integrity Rating System

In addition to the Drinan typology, another tool that assesses how an institution is doing with creating a culture of academic integrity, and how the campus potentially compares to other universities, is the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS). This measurement instrument was developed at the request of the International Center for Academic Integrity and was launched in 2010. The purposes of AIRS are to: identify benchmarks for institutionalizing academic integrity in schools, colleges, and universities and reward campuses for their efforts; curb cheating and empower academic integrity; allow colleges and universities to quickly compare themselves to their peer institutions; publicize for interested stakeholders the efforts of campuses to curb cheating and empower academic integrity; and stimulate and provide data for the international conversation on academic integrity.
The AIRS questionnaire (Appendix A) is intended to be a self-report by institutions and takes between four to six hours to complete and score. It is comprised of ratings in ten sections: policies and procedures, academic integrity groups/committees, academic integrity structural resources, student organization, education for students, education for academics/faculty and administrative staff, curriculum information, communication to the general public, process evaluation, and data collection. The AIRS is a fairly new rating tool that was not in existence in 2003. But when it became available in 2010, for comparison I completed the AIRS answering the questions from the 2003 Lehigh University perspective so I could gauge where the University was at that time.

As with many self-evaluative instruments, there is inherent value in the process of completing the tool, beyond just receiving the final score and categorization when it is completed. Taking the AIRS required 6 hours of in depth fact gathering and collaboration with others at the institution around the topic of academic integrity at Lehigh University. That process, in and of itself, had value in raising awareness on campus and building investment for the future efforts.

The AIRS questionnaire is comprised of measurements in the 10 sections noted above. Within each of these 10 sections, there is a series of items requiring responses including presence of programs and initiatives, illustrations of policies, presence of documentation to support answers, and historical information. Institutions can earn a maximum of 100 points in each of the 10 sections. The highest possible score on the AIRS is 1000 points.

When assessig the Lehigh University campus climate related to academic integrity in 2003 using the AIRS categories, the final score was 132 points. The score
of 132 placed Lehigh University in the Bronze category. Bronze is the least evolved
category in the AIRS model indicating that bronze level institutions are aware that
cheating on campus is problematic, but have little or no infrastructure or plans to
improve the situation. Lehigh University received 0 points in 8 of the 10 sections
indicating them as potential areas to improve upon: academic integrity
groups/committees, student organizations, education for students, education for
academics/faculty and administrators, curriculum information, communications to the
general public, evaluation, and data collection. Lehigh University received points in
only 2 of the 10 AIRS categories from the 2003 perspective: policies and procedures,
and academic integrity structural resources. The AIRS scoring and categorization
information is illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800-1000</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>Campuses that have scored at the Platinum level have made academic integrity an institutional priority, dedicating structural, monetary and human resources to the issue. Academic integrity is part of the campus culture, an idea that cheating is “something we just do not do here”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-799</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Campuses that have scored at the Gold level have implemented many helpful practices, structures and processes, but have more work to do in terms of instilling academic integrity as a core institutional value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-599</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Campuses that have scored at the Silver level have recognized academic integrity as important but have implemented very few practices, structures and processes to really demonstrate that academic integrity is an institutional priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-299</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Campuses that have scored at the Bronze level have recognized academic integrity is important and that cheating is a problem on campus, but have yet to implement many practices, structures or processes beyond the basics (e.g., a policy) to address the issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the AIRS completed using the state of the Lehigh University
campus in 2003 showed that the campus had much work to do. The AIRS tool was
also incredibly helpful in teaching me what work to undertake that would have a
positive impact on the campus climate. By examining the evaluative items in each category, I had a road map of potential interventions.

**Purpose of the Project**

After reviewing the literature, understanding the national context, reflecting on my professional experiences, and examining the “state of the union” at the University, I wanted to better understand academic integrity at Lehigh University in order to make informed decisions to improve campus climate related to academic integrity. One fundamental question guiding my project was: what is needed to create a campus culture and ethos that more visibly and deeply value academic integrity?

To better understand what was needed, I studied faculty attitudes and perceptions related to academic dishonesty at Lehigh University. I also utilized benchmark assessment tools to gauge progress administered in the beginning and end points of this project: Drinan’s Typology and the Academic Integrity Rating Scales. Administrators and faculty members were interviewed to form a complete picture of the situation. Student conduct data were reviewed and student opinions gathered about the topic. All of this information supplemented my professional experiences to assist me in making informed choices with the goal of improving the campus culture as it relates to valuing academic integrity.
Chapter 2

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Methodology

A mixed methodology was used to better understand academic dishonesty at Lehigh University and to inform decisions regarding recommendations and initiatives to improve the campus culture related to academic integrity. In addition to familiarizing myself with the literature in the field, I used quantitative and qualitative methods including personal experiences, individual interviews, a focus group interview, document review, critical incidents survey, and paired comparisons and bipolar scale surveys. I sought to understand the viewpoints of faculty, undergraduate students, and administrators as they related to academic integrity and academic dishonesty situations at the University. It is important that the perspectives of all three constituents were included as I formulated interventions, enhancements and recommendations to improve the campus culture related to academic integrity. These multiple sources of information allowed me to gain a rich understanding of the campus climate as it related to academic integrity.

Understanding Faculty Perspectives

To better understand Lehigh University faculty experiences related to academic integrity, I conducted a two part survey. In the first survey, I asked faculty to describe incidents of cheating they encountered in their classrooms using critical incidents methodology (Flanagan, 1954), an established qualitative procedure in which
respondents describe an actual scenario in some detail. The information elicited from this survey provided me with some very detailed examples of the type of cheating situations that faculty were facing in their classes. The critical incidents were then used in the creation of a second survey administered to different set of faculty: a Paired Comparison and Bi-polar Questionnaire. This hybrid combination of qualitative and quantitative methodology has been successfully applied to a variety of educational problems (Hollmann, 1996; Kaunitz, et al.,1986; Laughrin, 1997).

**Critical Incident Survey**

To understand the experiences of Lehigh University faculty related to cheating incidents in their classrooms, I collected qualitative data in the form of critical incidents of cheating that some of them observed over the course of their Lehigh careers. Forty full time Lehigh University faculty members, ten from each of the four colleges (Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Engineering and Applied Sciences, and Education) were selected using a random numbers table from the list of faculty in each college. These forty faculty members were sent a questionnaire via campus mail and asked to respond providing detailed descriptions of up to three cheating incidents they were aware of at Lehigh University (Appendix B). Flanagan (1954) stated that there are no firm rules about appropriate sample size for CIT. What matters is the complexity of the activity and the variety of the critical incidents rather than the number of participants.

This critical incidents technique, first described by Flanagan (1954) provides a qualitative description of the participants’ key experiences. Participants are asked to describe situations in which they have been involved that they viewed as critical or
important. Critical incident technique (CIT) is a respected qualitative method that offers a practical approach to collecting and analyzing information about activities and their significance to the people involved. It is capable of producing rich data that reflect the contexts of the situations people experience. Its creator John Flanagan described it as:

“A set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles. The critical incident technique outlines procedures for collecting observed incidents having special significance and meeting systematically defined criteria.” (Flanagan 1954, p. 327).

Nineteen of the forty faculty responded to the critical incident questionnaire. Forty three critical incidents were generated and described in detail by those nineteen respondents (Appendix C). For each incident reported, they were also asked to describe steps they took to respond to the incident, how they felt about the incident, and what effect they thought the incident and its resolution had upon the student involved and/or their classmates.

Analysis of the collected critical incidents enabled the identification of similarities, differences and patterns of how faculty experience cheating in the classroom. I found it very useful as a basis for creating the survey described below. I also learned a great deal from reading the stories of faculty members and their considerations when making decisions about how to respond to cheating incidents.
Card Sort Technique

Once these forty three critical incidents were collected, a card sorting technique was then employed to help identify themes and patterns. The goal was to cull the forty three incidents into a smaller set of representative incidents that could then be utilized in the next phase of the study, a paired comparison and bi-polar rating questionnaire. The card sort technique was also used to identify how different constituents (faculty, administrators, and students) view the same scenarios, and what dimensions they based their categories on when they performed the category sort procedure.

To prepare the forty three critical incidents for the card sort, each of the incident descriptions were typed on an individual index card using only the portion of the questionnaire that provided a detailed description of the cheating incident. The other responses on the questionnaires (response to incident, feeling about incident, impact of incident) were subsequently utilized in creating the bi-polar scales. Three volunteer judges (faculty member, administrator, and student) with experience in the university judicial system were instructed to sort the cards into categories of their own choice representing different types of cheating situations. I wanted to be sure that the judges used their intuition and their own context for sorting the incidents rather relying on prescribed categories.

The three judges were a faculty member who served on the University Committee on Discipline, the Assistant Dean for Student Conduct, and a junior undergraduate student who served on the University Committee on Discipline. They worked independently to sort the forty three academic dishonesty scenarios into categories that reflected their own judgment about the similarities and differences
among them. Each of the three judges were provided the following instructions for the sorting task.

Please sort the following incidents of academic dishonesty into categories that reflect your understanding of the similarities or differences among them. You can sort the incidents into as many or as few categories that make sense to you.

The 43 scenarios that the judges were presented with to sort appear below in the verbatim words of the respondents.

1. A student plagiarized from the Wall Street Journal book review section and handed it in as his/her own work.

2. A student gave his friend all of his tests from a class he took last semester to use because his friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor doesn’t change his exams from year to year.

3. A student completed an assigned paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering it up with a sheet of paper when he sat at a computer to compose his own paper. The student then proofread his paper and compared it to the source article. If it sounded like too close of a match, he revised his paper again. The finished product was very similar to the original source. The student said his high school priest taught him that this was the way to write a paper.

4. Two students handed in identical work on a project and indicated that they did work together on the assignment but claimed that each did their own final write up. However, the papers were identical and the instructor suspects they were disc copies.
5. A student turned in a paper plagiarized, in part, from a website. The student admitted to the plagiarism but indicated it was only part of the paper that was copied.

6. Two students turned in very similar papers. They admitted discussing the assignment, sources, and how to write the paper ahead of time. But both students said they wrote their own papers independently after these discussions.

7. A student copied material and presented it as her own work when she submitted the paper. She did not use any citations for the paper and the text included direct quotes from sources. The student said she did not mean to misrepresent the work as her own, but she didn’t know she had to cite such things.

8. A student turned in a paper with no references of source material she used, representing the paper as her original work. She had used websites and did not cite the source. She apologized and was embarrassed to face the professor.

9. A student in a very large undergraduate class took the final exam on behalf of another student.

10. A graduate student used additional handwritten material in an open book test. The student was international and English was his second language. He indicated that he didn’t understand the directions and wasn’t aware that he couldn’t use his notes. The instructor didn’t believe that explanation because there were other ESL students in the class that clearly understood the directions.
11. Students copied from each other on homework problem solutions and turned them in as their own work.

12. Two students submitted identical computer files as solutions to an assignment, but each student had their own name on the file they turned in.

13. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One student complained to the faculty member about the absence of one of the group members from their meetings. It was clear that one of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

14. Two students submitted identical computer programs as homework assignments, including the same student’s name appearing on both programs.

15. Two students had identical answers to questions on a final exam. The students indicated that they had studied together for the exam and that is why their answers were similar.

16. Two students handed in computer programs with had sections of code in them that appeared to be copies. The names of the variables were different, but the code was identical in portions of their programs.

17. A student was caught with their notebook open and referring to notes during a quiz.

18. During an exam, a student had her own notes mixed in with the pages of the exam and was observed using them.
19. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

20. One group of student plagiarized from another group on a team final report.

21. A student turned in, as their own work, a paper they purchased on the internet.

22. Two similar, but different, final exams were handed out randomly to the class. A student handed in an exam containing answers to the exam which he did not take.

23. After an exam was graded and handed back to students, a student brought his exam to the professor and said that he had answered two questions correctly but did not receive credit for them. The student had erased his original graded answer and changed it before asking the professor to review it for credit.

24. On an exam, a student answered a question that was inconsistent with the calculations she did in the work that preceded that question. The instructor asserted that the student could not have arrived at the correct answer based on her own calculations. The student said she did mental calculations in her head to arrive at the answer.

25. A student paid another student to take a final exam on their behalf.
26. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with similar sections of code in both programs. The students worked together on the homework assignment because they were allowed to discuss it. One student provided the other student with their finished homework to look at before that student finished his own assignment.

27. One student took a printout of another student’s computer programming homework assignment from the computer in his room and used it to copy from when he worked on his own homework. The student was not aware that his program had been taken.

28. A student plagiarized portions of his final paper by not using quotation marks in some sections that were direct quotes from a source. In other sections that were directly taken from a source, he did not use quotation marks and also provided a different source for the material in his reference section. The instructor concluded that the student was attempting to appear to have done more extensive research than he did by listing multiple sources when it was clear he had used only one source for the paper.

29. A student copied sections of his final research paper from a website source and did not cite the source, representing the work as his own.

30. A student copied information from a website and turned it in as his own work when he submitted his take home final exam. The student indicated he only did this on one out of four questions.

31. Three students submitted identical computer program homework assignments. They indicated that they thought they were
allowed to work together on the assignment and didn’t believe they crossed the line from collaboration to copying.

32. A student handed in a paper with significant portions of it taken from a website gradesaver.com without citing the web source. The professor had warned the student that his rough drafts did not look like his own work before he handed the final plagiarized paper in.

33. A student submitted a paper that he did not write. He obtained the paper from a friend at another university and represented it as his own work.

34. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

35. A student turned in an exam for re-grading after the professor handed them back to the class. The professor had made a copy of the graded exams before he returned them to students. When he compared the one handed back in by the student for re-grading with the copy of the student’s exam that was turned back to him, it was clear that four answers had been changed. The student acknowledged that the answers appear to have been changed, but was adamant that he did not do so. He provided several faculty letters of reference about his character and support from them indicating they believed his account of the situation.

36. A student copied another student’s homework assignment and turned it in as his own. He took the other student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission and copied it.
37. During an exam, a student referred to their notes which were not permitted. The student had handwritten notes on a copy of the Brown and White newspaper and viewed the cheat sheet during the exam.

38. A student copied answers from another student’s exam while sitting next to him during the midterm.

39. A student received text messages on his cell phone from another student in the class during an exam. The messages provided answers to questions on the exam.

40. A student stole a copy of a final exam from a professor’s office the day before the exam was administered and used this information to study for the exam. He also provided the stolen exam to other students to use the night before.

41. A professor provides samples of a lab notebook for students so they can get a sense of what a good lab notebook entails. One student took one of these sample lab books (the work of a student in a previous semester) and changed the name and submitted it to the professor as his own lab notebook.

42. A graduate student provided false data in the research portion of their doctoral dissertation.

43. A student copied material and presented it as his own work in a paper submitted near the end of the semester. The student indicated that they were stressed and anxious to get home because a week prior to the paper deadline they were in a fight and struck in the face.
Table 1 displays the judges’ sorting results, percentage of items they agreed upon, and the resulting selection of nine critical incidents that were used to create the second survey, the bipolar scaled and paired comparison instrument.

Table 1  
Percentage Rater Agreement in Critical Incident Card Sort Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Faculty Judge</th>
<th>Student Judge</th>
<th>Staff Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4, 14, 31</td>
<td>4, 14, 31</td>
<td>4, 14, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 6, 26</td>
<td>12, 16, 26</td>
<td>6, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 25, 40</td>
<td>9, 25, 40</td>
<td>9, 25, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 36</td>
<td>27, 36</td>
<td>27, 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 23, 29</td>
<td>7, 8, 23, 29</td>
<td>7, 8, 23, 29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 28, 30, 34</td>
<td>5, 28, 30, 34</td>
<td>5, 28, 30, 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 17, 18, 19, 37</td>
<td>10, 17, 18, 19, 37</td>
<td>10, 17, 18, 19, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 33, 39</td>
<td>35, 38</td>
<td>22, 33, 35, 38, 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items selected as 9 representative scenarios for paired comparison questionnaire appear in **bold underlined type**.

I was able to select nine different scenarios that represented nine categories because there was 100% rater agreement in each of the categories on a representative incident. Scenarios 2, 3, 7, 13, 14, 19, 25, 34, 36 were selected as the nine
representative scenarios (Appendix D). These nine scenarios provided good information for the basis of the second survey’s paired comparison and bipolar rating questionnaire. They also demonstrated that faculty members noticed cheating in their classrooms. Nineteen faculty members were able to describe forty three experiences. The three most frequently described types of cheating incidents were related to cheating on exams/quizzes (sixteen of the forty three incidents), plagiarism (fourteen of the forty three incidents), and cheating on computer programming assignments (six of the forty three incidents).

Faculty members described a range of steps they took in response to these forty three incidents. In twenty three of the incidents the faculty members handled the situation themselves by confronting the suspected student about the cheating behavior and doling out a warning or levying grade consequences. In nine of the incidents, the faculty members reported the case to the student conduct officer. In six of the incidents, faculty members did nothing to respond to the incident. In three of the incidents, the faculty members required the students to rewrite the plagiarized assignment/paper. In one incident, the professor spoke to the entire class about plagiarism but did not confront or report the suspected student. In one incident the faculty member contacted the students’ parents to discuss the situation and then gave the student an F grade on the paper. The nine incidents that faculty reported to the student conduct office included all six of the students suspected of cheating on a computer programming assignment, and three students suspected of cheating on an exam.

I reviewed the faculty responses for each scenario to the questions “how did you feel about this incident?” and “what effect do you think the incident and its
resolution had upon the student(s) involved and your class or program?” Some themes emerged when describing the feelings faculty had about the incidents and also when commenting on the impact on the student. Faculty members shared sentiments related to their decisions not to report cases to the student conduct office. The following sentiments were mentioned more than once: concerns that it would take a lot of time for the faculty member to be involved in adjudication, belief that minor incidents should be handled by faculty, the cheating was not intentional because students did not receive enough preparation in high school about plagiarism, the student and/or parents would be upset with them for reporting the incident, the outcome of the student conduct process might be too harsh, the outcome might be too lenient, there might not be enough proof, remorse that they didn’t do more to prevent the cheating incident from occurring in the first place.

When exploring the nine incidents that faculty reported to the student conduct office, in all instances the faculty members expressed positive comments about the conduct process and outcomes. One faculty member stated, “It was a fair and thorough process and I believe it had an impact on the student.” Another reported, “I’ve brought forward cases many times and always find it to be a learning experience for the student.”

**Paired Comparison and Bi-Polar Questionnaire**

The nine selected critical incident representative situations were used to create a paired comparisons and bi-polar scales ratings questionnaire that was administered to a different, larger group of Lehigh University faculty members (Appendix E). The goal of this survey was to further understand the categories into which faculty members intuitively cluster cheating incidents, and then to get a sense of how they rate
certain types of cheating behaviors based on six scales (serious to minor, unintentional to deliberate, clear to ambiguous, attributed to student to attributed to situation, no sanction warranted to expulsion warranted, and handle the incident myself to refer to University Committee on Discipline). These six scales were developed based on themes that emerged in the critical incidents survey, information from my experiences as a conduct officer and Dean of Students, and trends in the literature.

In the paired comparisons section of the second survey, each of the nine representative situations was paired with each of the remaining eight situations, a total of 36 pairs. Respondents were asked to rate the similarity between the two proposed situations on a Likert scale ranging from very similar to very dissimilar. In the second section of this questionnaire, the bi-polar rating scales, respondents were asked to rate each of the nine scenarios on the six different bi-polar scales.

This paired comparison and bi-polar scales questionnaire was distributed to a randomly selected group of Lehigh University faculty, which did not include any of the nineteen respondents to the critical incident survey. Two hundred full time faculty members were randomly selected to receive the paired comparison and bi-polar rating questionnaire from the list of the remaining 460 full time faculty. Responses were received from ninety one faculty members (twenty six males and sixty five females). Ranks of the faculty respondents were: nineteen assistant professors, twenty two associate professors, and fifty full professors. One additional faculty member returned the questionnaire without completing the paired comparisons section and wrote a note on it, “I’m sorry but this is just too confusing to me. The situations are being repeated in a way I feel is trying to trap me. I have to quit this section, but I did complete part
III nevertheless.” Given that this particular survey was not completed in its entirety, I discarded it and did not include it in the tabulation of results.

There was a 45.5% response rate on the paired comparison and bi-polar rating survey. This allowed me to have good confidence that the results were accurate and potentially generalizable to the broader community of Lehigh University full time faculty members. An n=80 would have permitted me to reach a 95 percent confidence level with a confidence interval of 10. These results are based on an n=91, which means that this threshold was met and I can feel confident with a 95% certainty that these results are accurate, based on my population size of 460 full time faculty.

Results paired comparisons

The nine critical incident scenarios that were described by faculty members in their questionnaire responses appear below in the verbatim words of the respondents. They will be referred to by their corresponding scenario number in the data representations that follow.

Scenario 1. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know how to cite such things. (direct quotes no citations)

Scenario 2. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own. (copied source no citations)

Scenario 3. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it. (cheat sheet on test)
Scenario 4. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year. (gave friend old test)

Scenario 5. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers. (comparison to source, paraphrased)

Scenario 6. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment. (computer code identical collaboration permitted)

Scenario 7. A student paid another student to take his final exam (paid to take exam).

Scenario 8. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work. (stole homework and copied it)

Scenario 9. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product. (group project non participation)
Over seventy percent of faculty surveyed rated the following scenarios as very similar to each other:

- Scenarios 7 and 3 = 86.8%
- Scenarios 7 and 8 = 81.3%
- Scenarios 3 and 8 = 81.3%
- Scenarios 2 and 8 = 78.0%
- Scenarios 2 and 3 = 70.3%

Over seventy percent of respondents rated the following scenarios as very different from each other:

- Scenarios 6 and 7 = 89.0%
- Scenarios 8 and 6 = 85.7%
- Scenarios 6 and 3 = 84.6%
- Scenarios 7 and 5 = 80.2%
- Scenarios 7 and 1 = 80.2%
- Scenarios 1 and 3 = 73.6%
- Scenarios 2 and 6 = 72.5%

The table below displays the frequency of responses for all paired comparisons providing insight into what types of scenarios faculty members viewed as similar and different from each other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Situations Numbered 1 through 9</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents That Rated Pair as:</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents That Rated Pair as:</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents That Rated Pair as:</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Similar 0.0 – 1.50</td>
<td>Very Similar 1.75 – 3.25</td>
<td>Very Different 3.50 – 5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Description of numbered situations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paper included direct quotes but student did not use any citations, said she didn’t know how to cite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student copied half of his paper from other sources and did not use citations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student used cheat sheet during test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student gave his friend the old tests from a class he took previously that his friend is taking now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student paraphrased his work from source materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Two students had identical computer code on their homework assignment, but were permitted to “collaborate” on the homework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student paid another student to take his final exam for him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student stole someone’s homework assignment and copied it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A student assigned as a group member did not participate in the group’s project but placed his name on the final product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentages over 50% in bold type**
Results bi-polar rating scales

The bipolar Likert scales were converted to numbers for purposes of calculation with 0 as very similar and 5 as very different for the paired comparisons. In the bi-polar Likert scales design the first dimension listed in each scale was assigned 0 and the second dimension assigned 5. For example, in the “serious to minor” bi-polar scale, the far left of the scale “serious” was assigned a value of 0 and the far right of the scale “minor” was assigned a value of 5.

The means and standard deviations of the bi-polar ratings appear in Table 3. The pooled means and standard deviations across all respondents within each bi-polar scale were calculated to determine which scenarios within each of the six bi-polar scales had pooled means that were greater than one standard deviation above, greater than one standard deviation below, or within one standard deviation of the pooled means. Table 4 displays the pooled means.

Table 5 illustrates where each of the nine scenarios was ranked within each of the six bi-polar dimensions. In other words, Table 5 shows which scenarios within each bi-polar scale are considered the “most” vs. “the least” intense of the particular scales. For example, scenario 7 (student paid another student to take his final exam) was viewed as most serious on the “serious to minor” scale, and viewed as the scenario that faculty were most likely to refer to the University Committee on Discipline rather than handle on their own (“handle myself to refer to UCOD” scale).
Table 3  Means and Standard Deviations of Bi-polar Ratings for Nine Representative Cheating Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-polar Rating Scales:</th>
<th>Serious to Minor</th>
<th>Unintentional to Deliberate</th>
<th>Clear to Ambiguous</th>
<th>Attribute Student to Attribute Situation</th>
<th>No Sanction Warranted to Expulsion</th>
<th>Handle Myself to Report to Conduct Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct quote no citation</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copied source no citation</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat sheet used on test</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave old test to friend</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase and no citation</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer code identical</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stole homework and copied</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participate in group project but take credit</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-polar scale:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious to Minor</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>.4853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional To Deliberate</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>.5228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear to Ambiguous</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>.5435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute to Student</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>.4530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute to Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sanction Warranted</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>.4525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle Myself to Report</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.276</td>
<td>.7486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Conduct Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5  Highest Rated Scenarios for Each Bi-polar Descriptor in Descending Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serious to Minor</th>
<th>Unintentional to Deliberate</th>
<th>Clear to Ambiguous</th>
<th>Attributed to Student to Attributed to Situation</th>
<th>No Sanction Warranted to Expulsion Warranted</th>
<th>Handle Myself to Refer to University Committee of Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid to take exam</strong></td>
<td>Direct quote, no citation</td>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
<td>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</td>
<td>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheat Sheet on test</strong></td>
<td>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</td>
<td>Stole homework and copied it</td>
<td>Cheat Sheet on test</td>
<td>Gave friend old test</td>
<td>Direct quotes no citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stole homework and copied it</strong></td>
<td>Comparison to source, paraphrased</td>
<td>Cheat Sheet on test</td>
<td>Stole homework and copied it</td>
<td>Direct quotes no citations</td>
<td>Gave friend old test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copied source, no citations</strong></td>
<td>Gave friend old test</td>
<td>Copied source, no citations</td>
<td>Copied source, no citations</td>
<td>Comparison to source, paraphrased</td>
<td>Comparison to source, paraphrased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Project Non-Participation</strong></td>
<td>Group Project Non-Participation</td>
<td>Group Project Non-Participation</td>
<td>Group Project Non-Participation</td>
<td>Group Project Non-Participation</td>
<td>Group Project Non-Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct quotes no citations</strong></td>
<td>Copied source, no citations</td>
<td>Gave friend old test</td>
<td>Comparison to source, paraphrased</td>
<td>Copied source, no citations</td>
<td>Copied source, no citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison to source, paraphrased</strong></td>
<td>Cheat Sheet on test</td>
<td>Comparison to source, paraphrased</td>
<td>Direct quotes no citations</td>
<td>Stole homework and copied it</td>
<td>Stole homework and copied it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gave friend old test</strong></td>
<td>Stole homework and copied it</td>
<td>Direct quotes no citations</td>
<td>Gave friend old test</td>
<td>Cheat Sheet on test</td>
<td>Cheat Sheet on test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</strong></td>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
<td>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</td>
<td>Computer code identical, collaboration permitted</td>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
<td>Paid to take exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Some interesting findings emerged from the scenario rankings across the six bi-polar scales. Specifically, there are two distinct groups of four scenarios each that clustered together in either the top or bottom of the rankings across each bi-polar scale. The first cluster of four scenarios are: paid to take exam (scenario 7), cheat on a test (scenario 3), stole homework and copied it (scenario 8), and copied source without citations (scenario 2). These four cheating examples were grouped together on all six scales. They were all considered “most serious” by faculty respondents. They also were ranked as the most deliberate academic dishonesty examples and the clearest incidents of cheating among the nine scenarios. They also are the four scenarios faculty ranked highest on behaviors more attributed to the students’ responsibility rather than the situational context. In addition, these four scenarios are the instances that faculty believed warranted the most severe sanctions (towards expulsion end of scale). In these same four scenarios faculty members indicated they would be most likely to refer the case to the UCOD rather than handle it themselves.

These four scenarios were also rated as most similar in the paired comparisons section of the questionnaire. That information indicated that faculty viewed certain types of cheating as more egregious and worthy of harsher consequences.
The second group of four academic dishonesty scenarios that clustered together on all six scales are: direct quotes no citations (scenario 1), comparison to source, paraphrased (scenario 5), gave friend old test (scenario 4), and computer code identical collaboration permitted (scenario 6). These four scenarios were ranked as the most minor, unintentional, ambiguous, most attributed to the situation rather than the student, no sanction warranted, and most likely for faculty to handle themselves rather than formally report the incident to the University Committee on Discipline.

Scenario 9 (group project non-participation) fell within one standard deviation of the pooled mean on each of the six bi-polar scales (serious to minor, unintentional to deliberate, clear to ambiguous, attributed to student or attributed to situation, no sanction warranted to expulsion warranted, and handle myself to refer to UCOD). These results illustrate a robust consistency of faculty perceptions and attitudes about these types of cheating incidents.

**Faculty Member Interview**

I conducted an interview with a faculty member in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences to gain a more in depth perspective of one professor’s experiences and perceptions at Lehigh University. The faculty member I selected to interview had been at the University for 32 years and was thus able to draw on years of experiences. During his long career, he has served as department chairperson, chaired the educational policy committee, and joined the university committee on discipline. He is a revered teacher and researcher and is well respected by his colleagues, students and administrators. He has regularly reported cases of academic dishonesty to the student conduct officer and at times has been critical of the process.
His critique has always been combined with a commitment to partner with student affairs to improve the system.

During the interview, which was really an in-depth conversation, he expressed sadness about the amount of cheating at Lehigh University and also nationally. In addition to the frequency of cheating, he is discouraged by the reaction of many students when they are reported for suspected cheating – anger at being caught rather than remorse for their behavior. But he is just as passionate expressing frustration about some faculty members who he sees taking no steps to prevent cheating and dealing with cases on their own when they do occur. When asked if he’s seen changes in the campus culture related to cheating in his tenure at Lehigh, he thought about his answer for some time before responding, “I think we have made strides in making the campus more aware of academic integrity as a concept, rather than just trying to catch cheaters.” When asked to expand on that sentiment, he mentioned visible rituals that are present now in the lives of students that were not present a decade ago: academic integrity statements by senate, signed pledges during new student orientation, the president discussing the pledge during formal convocation, the provost’s office providing teaching scenarios for faculty to use when discussing academic integrity with their classes, and a website presence which includes resources for students and faculty. (See chapter three for more discussion of those initiatives).

The faculty member also commented that cheating is a broader ethical issue and students are greatly influenced by what they see going on in the world around them. He highlighted famous “cheating” scandals in politics, finance, entertainment and sports (Watergate, Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky, Bernie
Madoff, Enron, Martha Stewart, and Tiger Woods). He postulated that when college students see famous people do unethical things, they lose faith in systems and that could influence their own decisions regarding ethical behavior. This path of our discussion led us to agree that a more sustainable effort of working towards a culture of integrity on campus may be better grounded in making some systemic changes in campus climate that go beyond responding to individual students who have already cheated. As we wrapped up the interview, I asked him to comment on areas he considers as the next horizon at Lehigh University in order to improve the campus culture of integrity. He replied, “I’d like to see it become everyone’s job.” He offered to assist with any future efforts.

**Understanding Students’ Perspectives**

**Institutional Data**

Lehigh University participated in two national academic integrity studies conducted by Professor Donald McCabe in the past twenty years: 1990 and 2005. Both studies shed light on Lehigh University students’ perspectives of academic integrity on campus at those times.

In the fall of 1990, McCabe surveyed students at 31 of the most competitive colleges and universities in the United States (McCabe and Trevino 1993). Fourteen of the schools had traditional academic honor codes, and 17 schools lacked honor code systems. The data from the 1990 study showed that, nationally, 47 percent of students at schools with no honor codes reported participating in one or more serious incidents of test or exam cheating during the previous year, and 24 percent of students at schools with honor codes reported exam cheating. Overall, the study reported that 67
percent of 6,000 college students surveyed admitted to one or more incidents of classroom cheating. McCabe also noted that many of the students in the national data set were troubled by the failure of their institution and its faculty to address the issue of cheating. They believed that weak institutional policies and unconcerned faculty were allowing students to cheat and gain an unfair advantage.

Lehigh University was one of the 31 schools that participated in Donald McCabe’s 1990 national study on academic dishonesty. The data collected from Lehigh University students indicated that academic dishonesty was more prevalent here than nationally. Twenty nine percent of students surveyed at Lehigh University in 1990 reported that they believed that over 50 percent of their classmates had cheated on an exam or paper in the previous year. In contrast, only 8 percent of the total 6,000 students surveyed nationally believed over 50 percent of their classmates cheated on an exam or paper. Sixty-five percent of Lehigh students surveyed indicated that they had engaged in test cheating while at Lehigh, whereas only 35 percent of the students surveyed nationally reported cheating on an exam. Ninety percent of Lehigh students surveyed indicated that they had engaged in some kind of cheating (not limited to tests), compared with 71 percent of students surveyed nationally who reported participating in cheating activity while in college.

Seventy three percent of Lehigh respondents believed that their chances of being caught cheating were either low or very low. Only 1 percent of Lehigh students believed that the typical Lehigh professor would formally report cases of academic dishonesty. This is a much lower percentage than the 30 percent of students surveyed nationally who thought that faculty would formally report cases of academic dishonesty. However, only 3 percent of Lehigh respondents believed that the typical
faculty member would do nothing if they caught a student cheating. The large majority of Lehigh student respondents, 96 percent, believed that the faculty member would handle the cheating incident on an individual basis instead of formally reporting it to the appropriate authority. These students indicated that the most typical faculty responses to cheating were a warning (14 percent), failure on the test/assignment (77 percent), or failure for the course (9 percent).

During the course of my research on academic integrity at Lehigh University, we had the opportunity to participate in a second research study. In 2005, 15 years after the 1990 study, Lehigh University students participated in another national study conducted by the Center for Academic Integrity and Professor Donald McCabe, Rutgers University. This study was a web based survey of over 63,700 undergraduate and graduate students on 83 different college campuses over the course of three years (2002-2005). This survey assesses student perceptions of the overall campus climate of academic integrity and also asks them to self-report instances of cheating in which they have engaged in during the previous year.

Nationally, the data indicate that cheating on tests and examinations was reported by roughly one in 10 students who admitted to one or more of the following test cheating behaviors: copying from another student without their knowledge (11%), helping someone else cheat (10%), copying from another student with their knowledge (9%), and using crib notes (8%). A third of students surveyed nationally report they have obtained information about what is on a test from someone else who had already taken it (33%).

These nationally reported test cheating frequencies are very similar to the Lehigh University students’ self-reported behavior frequencies. Roughly one in ten
Lehigh University students also reported copying from another student without their knowledge (13%), helping someone else cheat (14%), copying from another student with their knowledge (10%), and using crib notes (13%). Also, nearly a third of Lehigh University students reported they had obtained questions and answers from someone who had already taken the test (36%).

Related to students’ perceptions of seriousness of cheating behaviors, nationally students reported perceiving the following five test cheating behaviors as the most serious: copying from another student without their knowledge, copying from another student with their knowledge, helping someone else cheat on a test, using crib notes, using unauthorized electronic device to obtain information during an exam. The Lehigh University students’ responses to perceptions of seriousness on test cheating behaviors was the same as the national data. Lehigh students reported the same five test cheating behaviors as the most serious infractions, compared to the remaining two choices they viewed as less serious: learning what is on a test from someone who already had taken it, and using a false excuse to delay taking a test.

Both the national and Lehigh University data indicated that students self-reported cheating less frequently the behaviors they associated with the most serious forms of cheating. This indicates that there may have been some active attempt to refrain from what they considered to be “serious” cheating on tests.

The survey results related to cheating behaviors on written work is also similar between the national data and the Lehigh University students’ self-reported behavior. However, in both national and Lehigh student data, cheating behaviors on written assignments reported to have occurred more frequently than cheating on tests. In both the national and Lehigh University populations, one quarter to one half of students
reported participating in the following four behaviors related to written assignments during the previous year: working with others on an assignment when asked for individual work (42% nationally, 69% Lehigh University), paraphrasing a few sentences from a written source without footnoting it (38% nationally, 39% Lehigh University), paraphrasing a few sentences from an internet source without footnoting it (36% nationally, 47% Lehigh University), and receiving unpermitted help from someone on an assignment (24% nationally, 46% Lehigh University).

Students nationally and at Lehigh University reported participating less frequently in the following five cheating behaviors related to written assignments: falsifying a bibliography (14% nationally, 13% Lehigh University), turning in work copied from another (8% nationally, 7% Lehigh University), copying material word for word from written source without citation (7% nationally, 1% Lehigh University), turning in work done by another (7% nationally, 6% Lehigh University), and obtaining paper from term paper mill (3% nationally, 1% Lehigh University).

Similar to what occurred with perceptions of seriousness of cheating behaviors related to exams, when rating cheating behaviors on written assignments, students nationally and at Lehigh University typically rated most serious those five behaviors that they self-reported participating in less frequently. These five written assignment cheating behaviors were rated most serious by students: obtaining paper from term paper mill (89% nationally, 94% Lehigh University), turning in work done by another (86% nationally, 96% Lehigh University), copying written material almost word for word from a written source without citation (91% nationally, 96% Lehigh University), and turning in work copied from another (88% nationally, 96% Lehigh University), and falsifying a bibliography (58% nationally, 58% Lehigh University).
An interesting observation is that less than half of students nationally and at Lehigh University in 2005 reported that they believed working with others on an assignment when asked for individual work, and receiving unpermitted help from others on an assignment, were serious offenses. What, if anything, is going on related to the perceptions that working with others, even when not permitted, is not a serious offense? In my 28 years of experience in higher education, this current generation of college students is being exposed to the concept of teamwork, group projects, group goals, interdisciplinary projects, and a host of other expectations that encourage people to work together to solve problems. Perhaps higher education is sending confusing messages around group work. Even when a faculty member prohibits collaboration on a particular assignment, it may be that students are already habitually used to working with others from their experiences in different classes and co-curricular settings.

Perceptions related to campus climate

I do not have access to the national data on some survey items related to campus climate and academic integrity. But I do have the Lehigh University data set. Eighty seven percent of surveyed Lehigh students indicated they had been informed about academic integrity policies on campus. The main sources of the information came from the student orientation program, faculty, student handbook, and other students. Seventy four percent of Lehigh students indicated they observed another student cheat during a test/exam. Ninety seven percent of Lehigh students surveyed indicated they never reported another student for cheating behaviors. Eighty one percent of Lehigh students surveyed were very unlikely or unlikely to report an incident of cheating they observed. Ninety four percent indicated that they believed the typical Lehigh students would be very unlikely or unlikely to report a cheating
incident. Seventy four percent of students disagreed or were not sure if cheating is a serious problem at Lehigh. Thirty six percent of students believed that faculty report suspected cases of cheating. Interestingly, 80% of the students indicated that compared to their peers they cheat “a lot less”. Seventy nine percent of Lehigh University students reported they believed that other students’ cheating is unfair.

The 2005 survey provided students with the opportunity to write open-ended responses and comments related to their motivations for not cheating and overall comments they wanted to make. Fifty two Lehigh University students provided comments in this section. While not statistically significant, these open ended comments provide some insights. When discussing the topic of motivation to cheat, 37 students’ provided comments which could be organized into three themes: 1) values, 2) fear of being caught, and 3) peer influence. Fifteen students provided more general comments (not related specifically to motivation to cheat). Figure 1 provides some examples of selected students’ verbatim comments submitted in the survey’s open-ended response section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation to cheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: Family has had the biggest impact on my view of cheating. My father would beat my ass if he ever found out that I cheated when I was a kid so I learned how to get good grades by studying and not by cheating, therefore I don't feel that I need to cheat in order to receive good grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: I choose not to cheat because I always learned that it was wrong, and I generally don't need to. I'm here to learn, and if I don't learn the material now I will need to in the future or I will fail in the real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: I think that a person's values are the most important because this is my driving force in not cheating although throughout my entire education I have witnessed others cheating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of being caught</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: I think for the most part peer environment is the most important. Kids care about what their friends think no questions asked, if their friends do it they will think it is ok and if not then they won't do it either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: I think religious and moral values are probably the least of it for people I know. It's more realistic in the sense of worrying about getting caught. More people are inclined to cheat on papers and assignments than exams because it's a lot harder to get caught in the act of cheating. I think people also rationalize that helping each other on papers or using sources without footnoting them is not really &quot;cheating&quot; in the sense of copying someone's answers on a serious exam. I usually only have 2 exams a semester, so cheating on that is a serious offense but my major involves a lot of paper writing, so that is seen as less serious because they are frequent assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: I believe the only way to stop students from cheating is to watch them vigilantly. During exams, have many helpers surveying the students for cheat sheets and wandering eyes. Regarding papers, have digital versions of the paper compared against a database of old papers. Also, completely change exams and paper topics each year if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
possible.

**Peer influence**

Response: I think for the most part peer environment is the most important. Kids care about what their friends think no questions asked if their friends do it they will think it is ok and if not then they won't do it either.

Response: Peer environment and the fact that at Lehigh, people are not very competitive maybe makes the various forms of cheating occur more often without being caught. I find that a lot that may be considered cheating is just helping, as far as old exams, old reviews and things to that nature go, as most students in this school look to help each other rather than being at competition to get the best grade. I would rather our environment be like that, but teachers should respond to that by always keeping exams different and up to date. No one gives their friends exams because it’s the same one, they give them to them because it’s just an extra review they can use so they can get some extra help.

Response: Many factors will go into a student’s views on cheating. The fact of the matter is, if you cheat you do not learn the course material. Therefore, if the student is engaged and interested in what they are studying, they will have a natural incentive not to cheat. I see the basis for much of the cheating I observe due to the fact that students do not choose their courses based on their true academic interests (or may simply lack intellectual curiosity). This occurs when students feel peer pressure to choose one major over another because of social, family, or financial issues and motivations. I do believe that even in the best case scenario, there will be minor cheating. Students are naturally very busy, and it some cases it simply saves time. Also, the competition is hard and peer pressure is profound.

**Open-ended general comments**

Response: I have heard about or seen some pretty ridiculous lengths to cheat. Someone took my girlfriends homework out of the folder in a math class without her knowing to copy. Little did they know she happened to sit right behind them. So after she got it back she told the professor to make sure she knew that she wasn't part of the cheating. In the end the professor did nothing about the cheaters. I have seen people come to a test, look at it, then leave the room, print out something that would help with answers, the come take the test with the paper on the desk.

Response: Sometimes in a stadium seating style room people will
have a cheating "tree" where someone will be the test. Take and the people next to and behind them and the people behind those people will all get answers from the first person. Most recently I had a test that was too long for the class, so the professor let us retake it on our own under the honor system. Of course I get messaged to come to the library for group work on the project but for a few points it's not worth it to me. The funny thing is that class average went from a 65 to a 92 and the professor said she thought everyone adhered to the honor code. Haha what a joke! I guess cheating only bothers me when it affects my grade due to ruining a curve. I don't blame people though because it's very rare to get caught and the professors either don't care or don't do anything anyway.

Response: I think in general, the idea of cheating is not very much enforced on a university level, but may be in certain classes. As a math major, I find that doing my work in groups is better because we can all help each other. No one person does all the work, and I learn much better than sitting alone not understanding the work. To some teachers, that may be considered 'cheating', however, if working together is done properly, no one is cheating. As for papers, I can see where plagiarism and taking exact essays from people is an issue, but again, I am a math major and placed out of English classes, so I have very very rarely written papers, and if I have, I'm sure I didn't accurately give credit to my sources, more so because I don't know the proper ways to do so. Many students never cheat, but the ones who do cheat engage in it very often. Seeing people cheat makes me feel less guilty about cheating myself, and then I can rationalize that it is putting me on a level playing field.
Lehigh University Student Conduct Measures

The Lehigh University judicial statistics reveal that only 16 formal cases of academic dishonesty were reported by faculty from 1990 to 1991, the time period of McCabe’s study. In addition, there were 42 academic dishonesty cases formally reported by faculty from Fall 1996 to Spring 1999. These numbers reflect a large gap between the high incidence of self-reported cheating and the low incidence of formally reported cases. Additionally, reluctant faculty made several telephone inquiries about the formal judicial reporting process each semester, but eventually decided not to formally report cases of cheating.

However, prior to 2006, the university did not keep annual statistics of academic dishonesty cases on a regular basis, making it impossible to report accurate data for most of those years. However, in 2006 the student conduct office installed a software database system that is very capable of tracking conduct statistics. Between the academic years 2006 and 2013, a total of 265 students were reported to the Lehigh University office of student conduct and community expectations for alleged violations of the Code of Conduct related to academic dishonesty. Two hundred thirty-three of those 265 students (88%) were found responsible for academic dishonesty violations. The illustration of this situation appears in the tables and figures below.

While the number of reported cases varies year to year, it is evident that, even in the years with the most reported cases (44 cases in 2013-2014) there is still a gap compared to the much higher levels of student self-reported cheating behaviors in the McCabe’s 2005 study. There are several possible explanations for this gap between the high incidence of self-reported cheating and the low incidence of formally reported cases. Some faculty may not be aware of cheating occurrences, and some faculty may
detect cheating but decide to handle the incidents on their own and not report them to the university conduct officer.

In addition to illustrating this gap, the data also demonstrate the range and frequency of sanctions levied during academic years 2006-2013. The most frequently doled out sanction is disciplinary probation and the rarest sanction is expulsion. Exploring the impact of sanctioning severity on cheating behavior would be a desirable research project for the future.

Figure 2  Number of students reported, and found responsible for, suspected academic dishonesty violations at Lehigh University between academic years 2006 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Students Reported</th>
<th>Students Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3  Percentage of accused Lehigh University students found responsible for academic dishonesty violations by year from 2006 to 2013
Figure 4  Number and type of sanctions received by Lehigh University students found responsible for academic dishonesty violations between 2006 and 2013
Figure 5  Percentages of type of primary conduct sanctions assigned to 233 Lehigh University students found responsible for academic dishonesty violations between 2006 and 2013.

- Probation: 65%
- Warning: 17%
- Deferred Suspension: 11%
- Suspension: 5%
- Expulsion: 2%
Figure 6  Percentage of optional secondary sanctions assigned to 233 Lehigh University students found responsible for academic dishonesty violations between 2006 and 2013

- Secondary sanction: assigned grade of "F" 52%
- Secondary sanction: recommended grade to faculty member 30%
- No Secondary sanction assigned 18%
Undergraduate Student Senate Survey

When I began this project, although I was acutely aware of issues of academic dishonesty on campus, I was also aware of the palpable lack of conversation about academic integrity. During the course of this project, I believed it would be beneficial to attempt to engage students and faculty in discussions of the problem to help me understand the issues better and to also contribute to transforming the culture by exposing the situation. One forum I have access to is the Lehigh University Student Senate. I serve as advisor to this student government organization. In 2003 I raised the issue of academic dishonesty with the undergraduate Student Senate by sharing my experiences, observations, and the students’ self-reported cheating data. The senators became interested in examining aspects of this issue on their own, and they conducted a survey of their undergraduate peers. They had good participation in the survey, over 25% of the undergraduate student body (1,183 respondents). They produced a report based on their survey titled “Is Lehigh Ready for an Honor Code?” (Appendix F).

The survey conducted by the Student Senate was brief, posing eight questions and asking students to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the statements. They also engaged in some benchmarking research of other colleges to explore the concept of an honor code. The first question asked students to rate on a scale of zero (do not think it is a problem) to ten (it is a very big problem) how large of a problem they believe cheating is at Lehigh University. The most frequent response (over two hundred respondents) was a three on the scale, indicating that they believe cheating is not a large problem at Lehigh University. The largest number of respondents answered between three and six on the scale, with an average response of 3.9. Figure 2.7 illustrates the frequency distribution of responses to this question.
Student Senators posed two explanations of the results: 1) cheating is not perceived as a problem on our campus, and 2) students are so comfortable with cheating that they no longer see it as a problem. The survey also asked questions about when and how students cheated. The responses indicate that when students cheated the most frequently mentioned reason is a “heavy work load.” In addition, the survey results showed that copying homework assignments was the most commonly reported type of cheating.

Figure 7  Distribution of the answers to survey question: how big of a problem is cheating at Lehigh University on a scale from 0 – 10, (0 = you don’t think it is a problem and 10 = it is a very big problem)?
In their report the senators concluded that students are not seeing cheating as a serious issue on campus, yet these senators believed frequent cheating was occurring based on the data I shared with them. This led them to conclude that Lehigh was not ready for an honor code system because students don’t believe cheating is wrong and therefore would not embrace the honor code obligation to report cheaters.

They believed students first needed to be more aware of the problem in order for an Honor Code to have a chance of success. In their report they recommended that professors be urged to become more actively involved in fighting cheating in all forms. They mention that faculty members taking even small steps in their classroom culture can yield deterrent effects (create different versions of tests, follow outlined conduct procedures when dealing with a suspected violator, and sufficiently monitor exams). While their research was not scientific, the process was very useful in beginning to engage students in the discussion about academic integrity at Lehigh University.

**Council of Student Presidents Focus Group**

In Fall 2013, I consulted with a group of student leaders known as the Council of Student Presidents (CSP). This Council is comprised of the presidents of 22 undergraduate student organizations which are considered umbrella organizations in that each organization represents a large constituency of students. For example, the presidents of the three governing boards for fraternities and sororities are members of CSP (Inter-fraternity Council, Multi-cultural Greek Council, and Pan-Hellenic Council) and represent a total of 32 individual fraternity and sorority chapters. The president of the undergraduate Student Senate is a member of the CSP, symbolically representing all undergraduate students. The president of the Residence Hall
Association represents all campus residents. Other organizations’ presidents on CSP are Asian Cultural Society, Association of Student Alumni, Black Student Union, Class Officers for each of four classes, Feminist Alliance, Global Union, Graduate Student Senate, Latino Student Alliance, SPECTRUM (lgbtq group), Student Athlete Council, University Productions Programming group, Friends of Israel, LU Dance Marathon, and Peer Health Advisors. The CSP is therefore representative of many students on campus. In October 2013, I conducted a 90 minute focus group discussion with this group of 22 student leaders, sharing with them a summary of the information gathered from faculty in the 2003 study, the Student Senate survey, and the University’s student conduct statistics. Given that these students were only on campus for the past 1-4 years, they did not have a historical perspective beyond that time frame. However, they were able to share their impressions of academic integrity on campus. Specifically, I was interested in discovering the degree to which some of the interventions and initiatives were visible to students.

Each and every president recalled reviewing the Student Senate Statement on Academic Integrity during their new student orientation experience. They all recalled the formal convocation ceremony held the evening before their very first day of classes as a college student when there was a symbolic presentation to the President of the University of a binder holding the Senate Statement on Academic Integrity which included all their classmates’ signatures. Similarly, all 22 of the CSP members recalled seeing the resources related to Academic Integrity when they log on to the Lehigh University Course Site for each of their classes. 18 of the 22 students indicated that, at some point in their Lehigh academic experience, at least one of their
professors spent class time reviewing the academic integrity vignettes posted on the university’s on line learning environment, “CourseSite.”

When asked what are the situations that make it more likely for students to cheat at Lehigh, the most frequent answers were related to faculty behavior. One student reported students are not as likely to cheat in a class where they respect the professor. When asked about the meaning of the word “respect” in this context, another student, who agreed, replied, “If the faculty member forms a relationship with students then you don’t want to let him down by cheating in his class.” Two other students said it was most difficult to understand when a line is crossed in computer programming assignments because faculty encourage them to work in pairs on assignments, but tell them to write their computer code independently, which they found to be a difficult boundary to maintain.

Another student suggested that cheating is less likely to happen when a professor gives several quizzes and exams. The group discussed this for a few moments and others tended to agree, although they admittedly had not thought about that point before. It seems that in courses where they had to prepare for a weekly quiz, they learned to study regularly and knew the material better, so were less likely to be anxious about doing well. Also, when multiple quizzes and exams are required in a course, then no single grade is a “make or break” situation and the CSP members believed that reduces the motivation to cheat. When asked how often they were in classes that had such a format (multiple evaluations, quizzes, papers, exams), all 22 students reported that rarely was their experience. The most common experience among these students was to have 2 or 3 major exams in a class in addition to a final
exam. These 22 students were in all three of the undergraduate colleges (Business, Engineering, and Arts and Sciences), and I did not detect differences across colleges.

Summary

I used a variety of sources and methods to analyze the campus climate at Lehigh University related to academic integrity. Through surveys, interviews, a focus group, institutional data, and professional experiences, I explored the perspectives of students, faculty and administrators that influence the campus ethos and behaviors. Employing external frameworks such as Drinan’s typology and the Academic Integrity Rating Scale also assisted in assessing the Lehigh University campus environment and provided a reference point to measure future progress.

Faculty members at Lehigh University are observing cheating occur in their classes and provided multiple examples and descriptions of actual cheating incidents. The most frequently reported incidents were related to cheating on exams, plagiarism, and cheating on computer assignments. In more than half of the incidents described by faculty members, they chose to handle the cheating incident on their own rather than report the incident to the student conduct office. Faculty members identified the most serious offenses as a student paying another student to take an exam, cheating on a test, stealing homework and copying it, and copying sources without using citations. In addition to considering these four types of cheating as the most serious, faculty members also ranked them as the most intentional, the clearest examples of cheating, most likely the students’ responsibilities, warranting the most severe conduct sanctions, and the situations they were more likely to refer to the student conduct office.
National survey data indicates that Lehigh students report they cheat as often, or more frequently than, many other institutions’ students admit. The Lehigh students surveyed also indicate they believe their chances of getting caught cheating are low. However, in a 2005 national study, 87% of Lehigh University students indicated that they were aware of campus academic integrity policies and 94% of students believed the typical Lehigh student would be very unlikely to report someone for cheating.

Lehigh University student conduct statistics show an increasing trend in the number of students reported for alleged cheating violations over the last 8 years. In each of these previous 8 years, over 80% of students accused of academic dishonesty were found responsible for violations of the code of conduct. Publishing this statistic to the campus community may deter cheaters and reassure faculty members that the conduct system is effective.

Gaining a deeper understanding of the university’s experiences with cheating provided insights into faculty, student, and administrative contributions to the campus climate. All three sectors of the campus community have some power to contribute to a shift in the culture towards an ethos that deeply values integrity.
Chapter 3
PROGRESS MADE TOWARDS IMPROVING A CAMPUS CULTURE OF INTEGRITY

In Executive Position Paper Three, I discuss areas identified as needing improvement based on the data gathered during this project, and also review interventions and actions taken towards the goal of improving the Lehigh University campus climate related to academic integrity. One of the advantages of conducting in depth research at one’s own institution is that interventions, strategies, and programs can be implemented in real time during the course of the study. During this project, I tested many initiatives and implemented new practices based on the understandings reached from the data collection and analysis. Good progress has been made towards enhancing the campus climate and measures of this are reported in this chapter. Lastly, I provide recommendations for the future of Lehigh University’s continuing efforts to be a campus that truly values academic integrity.

Focus on campus culture

The literature posits that the culture on a college campus significantly influences the amount of cheating that occurs. However, Gallant and Drinan (2006) note that universities focus most of their attention on policing and punishing academic dishonesty rather than promoting and developing values of academic integrity. During the course of this project I became convinced that making this shift from focusing on the misconduct of individuals to addressing the underlying environmental factors which might be creating an unethical academic climate is the preferred approach.
It is clear that the surrounding culture and environment influence individuals’ choices and actions. While deterrence and holding accountable those who transgress are important components of a campus culture of academic integrity, many of the interventions and initiatives I recommended, and that came to be implemented, over the past decade were aimed at the broader campus climate rather than individual students’ conduct. Many of the changes were aimed at promoting awareness, educating this community, and developing values of academic integrity.

**Student Conduct Officer’s Perspective**

I conducted an interview with the Assistant Dean for Student Conduct and Community Expectations. He has been in this role for the past 12 years and oversees the entire student conduct system. When asked if he’s seen the campus culture shift as it relates to academic integrity during his time at Lehigh University, he said that he believes the institution has taken a more serious and comprehensive approach to academic integrity issues. He believes the issue has become more “owned” by all members of the community in recent years; in the past it was the concern of individual faculty members, dean of students staff members, and a few students.

When asked what initiatives or circumstances he believes made a positive impact on campus culture related to academic integrity during his tenure, he noted the following: development of an academic integrity web page, provost’s office incorporating academic integrity information into new faculty training, publishing academic integrity vignettes online and asking faculty to review them in classes, semester emails to all students informing them of academic integrity expectations and resources, increased presence of information literacy resources, new student orientation education, student senate’s development of an academic integrity
statement/pledge, and the approval and implementation of minimum sanctions for academic dishonesty cases. He also noted that there has been an increase in reported cases over the past decade, which he attributes to those institutional efforts to make everyone more aware of the issue.

In discussing the role of faculty members in promoting a culture of integrity, the conduct officer spoke about how important he believes faculty members are as mentors and role model who set the expectations in the classroom. He notes that one continual debate he has with some faculty members is related to their potential responsibility to monitor students to prevent cheating. Some faculty members strongly believe that their job is not to police the classroom. Others agree that they need to foster a classroom climate in which cheating is less likely to occur. He also regularly works to encourage faculty members to report any incidents of suspected cheating to his office. He admits that he doesn’t have an accurate sense of how many faculty members would report such instances, but he hopes through continuing to visit department meetings he can demystify the conduct process for faculty members.

When asked for summary comments, the Assistant Dean relayed that he is certain that the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations will continue to play a key role in fostering academic integrity at Lehigh University. But this is only one part of a complex institutional structure and its sphere of reach and influence is not limitless. To continue making progress, he believes (and I concur) that many other departments and stakeholders need to engage more regularly and institutional leadership needs to map the course.
Movement along the Drinan Typology Paradigm

It is important to recognize and appreciate the successes already accomplished. One of the paradigms used during this project to assess the institution’s climate is Patrick Drinan’s typology framework. When I began this project in 2003, Lehigh University was classified at the as somewhere in-between the “primitive” and “radar screen” stages of Drinan’s typology, a framework to describe institutional development related to academic integrity. In 2003, at Lehigh University, cheating issues were a concern because of weaknesses in academic integrity policies, lack of reporting, uninterested faculty and students, and rampant self-reported cheating. In addition, there was significant concern about the lack of consistency and fairness of existing practices given that some faculty handled cheating incidents on their own instead of forwarding the cases to the student conduct office. The “radar screen” stage is also characterized by the presence of most efforts on campus being led by administration, and there is typically very little student and faculty engagement. This description characterized Lehigh University in 2003. Administrators were responsible for enforcement, and faculty and students did not participate in the discussions, policy development, educational efforts, or strategic planning for the future.

There are four stages of development in Drinan’s Typology: primitive, radar screen, mature, and honor code. An examination of the Lehigh University campus’s academic integrity culture in present day, 2013-2014, reveals that much progress has been made. Using Drinan’s Typology, I would now describe Lehigh University as being at the “mature” stage of campus development. This progress occurred as a result of significant and sustained efforts over the past 10 years, as the campus embraced some of the recommendations that were made as a result of this project. In 2013-14, the university’s academic integrity policies and procedures are
widely known across campus by faculty, students and administrators. However, it is true that not all campus community members unequivocally abide by and support the current system. There are many ongoing efforts to train new faculty and socialize incoming students to the academic integrity resources and policy. There is a slight upward trend in the number of reported cases of alleged academic dishonesty violations. It is important that the university encourage attitudes and practices beyond monitoring and catching cheaters towards an environment of responsibility and trust between faculty and students.

**Honor Code**

The next, and final, developmental stage in Drinan’s Typology is “honor code”. Some research indicates that there is less cheating at honor code schools. But I am convinced that schools without honor codes can also achieve a reduction in cheating. Donald McCabe and other researchers on academic integrity recommend modified honor codes as an effective means for campuses to foster integrity and reduce dishonesty. McCabe and Trevino (2007) note that non-honor code schools have demonstrated reduced cheating when they clearly communicate a campus commitment to academic integrity and make it an active topic of discussion among students and faculty. Drinan notes that stage four “honor code” is not necessarily the best option for all schools. Many institutions can attain stage three, but getting to and sustaining an honor code system can be very difficult. In fact, stage three is a realistic and even preferred stage for many institutions.

Honor codes are partially defined by the presence of a zero tolerance approach to academic integrity violations. At honor code schools, students are expected to report any and all forms of cheating they observe, and there is typically a single
sanction of expulsion for violators. But does zero tolerance work? While evidence shows that students at honor code schools self-report lower cheating levels, it is not certain whether less cheating occurs. In addition, even if less cheating is occurring at honor code schools, there could be confounding variables at play given that many honor code schools are religiously affiliated, military affiliated, tend to have smaller enrollments, and are most often private schools.

Another concern I have about zero tolerance aspects of an honor code system is the philosophy is antithetical to many other elements of the student conduct system that are grounded in the goal of education instead of punishment. In an honor code system, a student is expelled for a first offense of academic dishonesty regardless of the severity of the violation. The system does not provide for gradations of severity, and the data gathered in my project indicate that Lehigh University faculty and students clearly view different forms of cheating as more serious than others.

This single sanction of expulsion does not provide an opportunity for the offending student to learn from the bad decisions by practicing non-cheating behaviors within the same community in the future. Also, there is a lost opportunity of potential restorative justice interventions between the student, faculty member, classmates, and the community. A zero tolerance policy for academic dishonesty also to discourages open and honest campus conversation. For all these reasons, I much prefer a modified honor code approach.

Over the course of this project, progress has been made at Lehigh University that moved the institution from a university that had no honor code characteristics to a situation that now has the university classified as having a modified honor code. The modified honor code approach was developed at the University of Maryland in the late
1990’s. The University of Maryland approach had students playing a major role in the academic integrity system, including participating in the adjudication of conduct cases, serving on university committees, and promoting academic integrity via peer presentations.

The current Lehigh University modified honor code environment has in place some additional hallmarks of a modified honor code including an honor pledge that all new students review and sign during orientation, peers involved in the discipline process, and proctored exams (faculty have the option to administer exams without a proctor present). The presence of this modified honor code contributes to Lehigh University being currently classified as “mature” within Drinan’s typology.

I recommend that Lehigh University continue to improve its current modified honor code to raise its prominence on campus. I recommend that the institution more proactively educate the campus community about honor codes, and specifically the fact that Lehigh University has a modified honor code. Currently, the campus does not use the language “modified honor code.” Instead, phrases such as “code of conduct” and “senate academic integrity pledge” are used to describe parts of the whole. By officially adopting and using the language “modified honor code”, I believe campus awareness and pride will grow and the symbolic language may deter cheating behaviors.

When considering generational theory, I believe that modified honor codes could appeal to the millennial generation’s values of trust, honesty, and community responsibility. The generational lens holds some interesting promise as I think about approaches for university administrators as they consider how to deliver messages about integrity. One strategy is to deliver messages about academic integrity that are
congruent with the values of this current generation of college students so that they will be heard and embraced.

A next horizon for Lehigh University may be to engage in a campus conversation about our intentions related to an honor code. A healthy debate on the issue of implementing an honor code at Lehigh University would serve to garner support for whatever becomes the agreed upon future direction. In his survey of college students, Aiken (1991) found that 55% of his respondents thought that discussing the problem of academic dishonesty would be an effective means to prevent dishonesty (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002, p.83). Is implementation of an honor code a goal that the university wants to pursue? That should be decided by the campus community after a thorough dialog raises awareness and understanding of what an honor code system requires.

**Critical interventions and efforts over the past decade**

During the past decade, several initiatives, discussions, interventions, and partnerships moved the needle in a positive direction towards creating a campus that more deeply values academic integrity. In chapter one I discussed the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS) as an institutional measurement related to academic integrity. In 2003, Lehigh University was rated as “bronze” on the AIRS, which is the lowest level in the rating system. Completing the AIRS assessment provided insight into how to plan initiatives and efforts that would have the best chances of improving the campus environment. The figure below provides a timeline of actions taken and the associated AIRS category that prescribed the intervention.
Figure 8  Timeline of events, initiatives, and programs at Lehigh University related to academic integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Events, Initiatives, Programs</th>
<th>AIRS category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2002-03       | *Dean of Students (Basso) attends Center for Academic Integrity’s national conference and meets with Lehigh University Deputy Provost to propose action steps to begin dialogs and initiatives on campus. Outcome: Three main forums begin working on topic of academic integrity: Student Affairs, Educational Policy Committee of Faculty, and Undergraduate Student Senate (ref. emails 2/12/03 and 7/29/03). *Student Senate conducts survey of peers’ attitudes and behaviors. *Faculty Educational Policy Committee convenes a sub-committee on academic integrity and report is made to the deans of the colleges (co-chaired by Basso and faculty member). Committee outcomes included:  - Development of an academic integrity website/online brochure  - University purchased Turnitin.com cheating detection software  - Faculty encouraged to put uniform academic integrity statement on all course syllabi | *Educ acad  
*Data C  
*Educ std/Educ acad/Curr info |
| 2003-04       | *Data collection begins for executive position paper: 2 faculty surveys. *Undergraduate Student Senate drafts, affirms and publishes “Student Senate Academic Integrity Statement”, (Appendix G). *Provost sends inaugural email to campus community affirming commitment to academic integrity and informing of progress. *Turnitin.com launched and faculty, students are encouraged to utilize it. *Academic integrity website launched providing policy information and resources to faculty, |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Data C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Comm pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Educ Std/Educ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>*Dean of Students engages Library/Technology services to develop information literacy web site with academic integrity information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>*Provost and Dean of Students send email to campus community encouraging all to foster academic integrity. A form of this email is now sent every semester as part of ongoing effort to embed academic integrity into ethos of campus (Appendix J).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 (continued)</td>
<td>*Student Code of Conduct is revised to include a new option for case resolution, an Academic Integrity Conference. This option is available when a student accepts responsibility for an academic integrity violation. It permits the faculty member/complainant to participate in a discussion with accused student to reach a sanction outcome. The final decision is made by 2 members of the University Committee on Discipline: an independent faculty member and student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>*Office of Student Conduct holds sessions during New Student Orientation for entire first year class discussing academic integrity and resources to assist in avoiding unintentional plagiarism. This now occurs annually with each newly admitted class. *During the New Student Orientation, all incoming students review and sign the Student Senate Statement on Academic Integrity and pledge to uphold the principles. The pledge is signed by all 1,200 new students during their first residence hall meeting and the document is formally presented to the president of the university at a convocation ceremony the evening before Fall classes commence. This symbolic practice has occurred annually since its 2006 inception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>*Graduate Student Senate drafts, affirms and publishes Student Statement on Academic Integrity (Appendix G).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>*Based on research conducted for this executive position paper, the Office of Student Conduct works with faculty to develop and publish sanctioning Guidelines for academic integrity violations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>*Academic Integrity website is placed on course management homepage (Course Site) so each student and faculty see it daily when logging into their class sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>*Student Conduct Officer, Director of Faculty Development, and Faculty Chair of the Disciplinary Review Committee make presentations to all new faculty and department chairpersons on issues related to academic dishonesty and integrity (technology and academic integrity, methods for preventing academic integrity, and the faculty side of the disciplinary process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>*Faculty department chairpersons raised concerns and suggested that faculty should be discussing academic integrity with their students. The Dean of Students Office collaborated with the Deputy Provost to develop a set of ethical vignettes that faculty could discuss as case studies with their classes. Faculty received a letter from the Provost requesting they discuss the vignettes in all first class meetings. *Office of Student Conduct begins publishing bi-weekly outcomes of judicial hearings including sanctions, hoping to serve as a deterrent and also a social norms effort. *Faculty chairperson of the University Committee on Discipline sends email to all faculty at end of Spring semester prior to final exams reminding them of the appropriate process for reporting alleged incidents of academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>*Director Faculty Development conducts assessment to solicit faculty feedback regarding the use of the academic dishonesty vignettes with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>*Completed Center for Academic Integrity’s Rating System (AIRS) survey– Silver Rating. <a href="http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/AIRS.pdf">http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/AIRS.pdf</a> *Launch of Student Life Curriculum (bLUeprint) which lays the foundation for values discussions related to academic integrity across all class years of students. *Student Affairs division approves additional conduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Integrity Rating System

Table 6 illustrates the dramatic improvement that Lehigh University has experienced over the past decade. The 2003 rating for campus was bronze, ten years later, Lehigh University improved to a silver rating more than quadrupling its raw score. This is a metric that demonstrates achievement in improving a campus culture that now values academic integrity in significant measure.
Table 6  Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS) scores by category in academic years 2003 and 2013 for Lehigh University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIRS Category</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/Y 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity Groups and Committees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity Structural Resources</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Academics/ Faculty and Administrative Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Information</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to General Public</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant environmental initiatives

Within the past 12 months, significant environmental initiatives have been developed on Lehigh’s campus that are targeted at improving campus culture related to values, identity development, and community building. These initiatives, while not developed with the sole intention of furthering a climate of academic integrity, have certainly contributed in that manner because of their focus on values clarification, identity development, leadership development, and community responsibility. All of these efforts set expectations for members of the Lehigh University community to “do the right thing.”

Some of the most impactful programs in recent years are efforts to educate students on bystander intervention skills, the development and implementation of a comprehensive student life residential curriculum, and teaching students how to engage in successful crucial conversations. All these programs emphasize the higher values of integrity, community, social justice, and assuming responsibility to self and others. Within this framework, it is a natural extrapolation that academic integrity is just another such expectation in a community that values civic behavior. I highlight two of these more recent initiatives that hold promise for significant positive impact on the campus culture related to academic integrity: the student life curriculum and bystander intervention education.

Student Life Curriculum

In 2014-14 Lehigh University’s division of student affairs launched a comprehensive residential student life curriculum named “bLUeprint.” This curriculum was the product of two years of intensive work by Lehigh University student life professionals. Through the student life curriculum, Lehigh students
actively participate in designing ("bLUeprinting") their own Lehigh experience drawing from opportunities intentionally offered on campus. The curriculum is grounded in research, developmental theories, and models. The major theoretical foundations of the bLUeprint experience are Dr. Marcia Baxter Magolda’s self-authorship theory and the social change model of leadership development (Appendix H).

Self-authorship is “the capacity to internally define a coherent belief system and identity that coordinates engagement in mutual relations with the larger world” (Baxter Magolda in Baxter Magolda & King, 2004, p.xxii). The behaviors associated with self-authorship theory are congruent with those that also support a campus culture that values academic integrity: living an authentic life, developing a personal philosophy and value set, gaining control over thoughts and responses, listening to one’s internal voice, and knowing and understanding oneself to develop authentic relationships. Similarly, some of the skills associated with self-authorship contribute to academic integrity as well: cognitive maturity, deciphering ambiguity, critical analysis, formation of integrated identity, and independent learning (Brown, 2009).

The social change model has been a respected model of college student leadership development for the past twenty years. The initial research on the social change model was conducted at the Higher Education Research Institute (UCLA). A main goal of the model is to facilitate positive social change at the institution and/or in the community by encouraging students to take actions and exhibit behaviors that help the institution/community function more effectively. Some key tenets are that leadership is nonhierarchical, values based and collaborative, leadership is a process not a product, and it is about change. The model highlights the interactions and
symbiosis between groups, individuals, and society. This model of leadership development should develop Lehigh University citizens who contribute to improving the campus climate related to academic integrity. The social model was developed specifically for the college undergraduate population, so it is extremely relevant to campus environments. Both the social change model of leadership development and the self-authorship theory provide ideal conditions for the Lehigh University student life curriculum (bLUeprint) to flourish.

The Lehigh University bLUeprint program’s five foundations for student success are:

Creative curiosity-- Students will ask big questions, seek mindful solutions, and develop an inquisitive outlook on the world.

Identity development -- Students will continue to develop into their own unique person, become grounded in their multiple identities, and live out their carefully chosen values and beliefs.

Collaborative connections -- Students will learn to build positive relationships and engage in dialogue, utilizing their personal values and inquisitive outlook as a guide.

Inclusive leadership -- Students will make decisions, take action, and contribute positively to their communities in ways that are purposeful, socially just and built on integrity.

Professional growth and success -- Students will utilize their intellectual passions and talents to create and enact a personal definition of success that positively represents themselves, their profession, and their communities.
In the bLUeprint program, students embark on a journey of creating their unique pathway towards a personally meaningful Lehigh experience. Along the way they receive coaching and resources from a variety of people and places including student affairs administrators, faculty members, club advisors, team coaches, resident assistants, chapter advisors, leadership trainers, peer educators, and orientation leaders. Given that bLUeprint is embedded in Lehigh University’s students’ residential experiences, there is a wealth of opportunity to make connections with the academic integrity culture (Appendix H). While the entire curriculum should enhance the campus ethos of academic integrity, the foundations of identity development and inclusive leadership could be maximized to encourage students to make ethical individual choices and change the campus climate in positive ways.

Every Lehigh University student is taught about the bLUeprint curriculum from the very first day they arrive. They actively engage with residence life staff and orientation leaders to begin “bLUeprinting” their Lehigh experience by designing what they want to become and experience in college based on the five foundations of the program. As they move through orientation, residence hall life, co-curricular experiences, clubs and organization membership, community service hours, study groups, and social activities, they continually see connections between their experiences and the bLUeprint program. They participate in reflection activities and journaling to refine their personal path. There are many opportunities for the university to connect this comprehensive curriculum experience with the goals of improving the campus as it relates to academic integrity by engaging students around their values.
Bystander Intervention

The bystander effect is a familiar concept in social psychology that refers to the experience of an individual who, in the presence of others, sees some harm or potential harm being done and fails to intervene. A bystander is essentially a person who observes a problem and wants to do something, but doesn’t. There has been some excellent work done to teach students about the bystander effect and its contribution to perpetrating undesirable conditions, such as sexual assault, alcohol abuse, racism, hazing, and discrimination. There are a number of bystander education programs available and in use at high schools and colleges across the country that teach students how to recognize a situation and act to intervene safely. Bystander intervention strategies, when embraced and practiced within a community, can make the campus healthier.

Research has found that people tend to struggle with whether helping out is their responsibility. One of the major obstacles to intervention occurs when multiple witnesses make it much less likely that an individual will step up because he/she believes someone else will. There are several other major reasons that bystanders fail to intervene: the situation is too ambiguous; the bystander is worried about misjudging the situation and thus will be embarrassed by intervening; the bystander believes the other people will reject their efforts. Bystander intervention programs teach people to overcome their reluctance to “do the right thing” in such situations.

As Dean of Students at Lehigh University, I observed many instances of this bystander effect and heard descriptions of incidents from second hand accounts. There is a social phenomenon on Lehigh’s campus that some students have described as “social suicide.” As students have defined it, this term refers to acting in a manner that will result in being ostracized from their peer group. From my professional
discussions with student affairs colleagues across the country, I know that this condition is not unique to Lehigh University. However, its presence is felt daily when talking with students about the choices they make. Some of the most common settings for this “social suicide” experience are in fraternity or sorority life, athletic teams, within homogenous race and socio-economic class groups, and within the context of gender identity in groups. But perhaps the overriding theme is a significant fear of confronting a peer about undesirable behaviors such as consuming too much alcohol, cheating on tests, hazing new members, perpetrating acquaintance rape, or making racist and sexist comments.

At Lehigh University, we had some success in the past with implementing a bystander education program focusing on teaching students to intervene in instances when they observe a peer engaged in undesirable, unsafe, or unethical behaviors. This academic year, the student affairs division is re-invigorating its bystander education efforts and developing a comprehensive model that will be sustainable. I plan on exploring that program’s application to issues related to academic dishonesty. The same skill sets could apply to teach students, faculty, and staff how to recognize and intervene in potential situations of academic dishonesty they experience or observe.

This approach would give community members some specific roles that they can use in preventing cheating, intervening during a potential academic dishonesty incident, and speaking out against ideas and behaviors that support academic dishonesty. For example, students could be taught a number of intervention and response options if someone approaches them in a peer group setting and asks to copy their homework assignment.
During many academic dishonesty conduct hearings I’ve observed, students describe episodes when they didn’t want to allow a peer to use their work, but they lacked language or skill set to get out of the situation by upholding expectations of ethical behavior. In bystander education programs, students are encouraged to recall some of the common scenarios they experienced and then are taught multiple response strategies to uphold their values and the academic integrity value of Lehigh University. Everyone has a role in changing community knowledge, attitudes and behaviors.

**Recommendations for the future**

My recommendations for Lehigh University over the next five years appear below. Most of the recommendations support a continued shift towards creating an environment of responsibility and shared ethical values rather than onerous efforts to catch cheaters. With that in mind, many of the proactive steps have the potential for symbolic influence to shape a campus ethos of integrity. The involvement of faculty, staff and students is critical for these efforts to succeed. These recommendations are grounded in past successes, best practices in the field of higher education, and are based on the ten categories of the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS):

**Recommendations**

1. **Policies and Procedures**

Examine ways to integrate restorative practices into the conduct sanctions for academic dishonesty violators. Restorative practice is a new field of study that emerged from the field of restorative justice. The foundational principle of restorative practice is the belief that people are happier, more cooperative, and more likely to
make positive changes when those in authority do things with them, rather than to them or for them. The use of restorative practices in education settings has improved overall climates and shown to reliably reduce misbehavior, bullying, violence and crime among students. This past academic year, the division of student affairs began to investigate possible applications for restorative practices including student conduct. The International Institute for Restorative Practices is located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, less than 1 mile from Lehigh University’s campus, making it a very accessible resource.

2. **Academic Integrity Groups/Committees**

   This is one of three categories in which Lehigh University scored 0 points on the 2013 AIRS rating scale. The other two categories that yielded 0 points are Student Organizations and Process Evaluation. Recommendations that apply to these latter two categories appear below. To improve the institution’s score in the category Academic Integrity Groups/Committees, I recommend the establishment of an academic integrity council of faculty, staff and students who work to further university plans and strategies, market efforts, organize initiatives, and regularly evaluate campus culture.

3. **Student Organization**

   The academic integrity council recommended above also applies to this AIRS category. The students that would serve on the recommended Academic Integrity Council provide a very important perspective that must be included. I believe the establishment of this standing committee which includes students would encourage students to serve as peer educators on the topic of academic integrity. Currently, the
undergraduate student senate has a standing sub-committee that focuses on academic issues but their role is not specifically related to academic integrity. There are some other venues for students to be involved in academic integrity discussions with faculty and administrators as they serve on various university standing committees including the educational policy committee, college advisory councils, and the faculty committee on student life. However, there is currently not a university standing committee dedicated to academic integrity.

4. Academic Integrity Structural Resources

The university has made an investment of personnel resources in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations by increasing the staff this year. The addition of an assistant director, whose job description includes the expectations of outreach education and prevention work, should improve the reach of proactive measures to engage students in values based dialogs. I also recommend that the university consider increasing the role that students play in the conduct process, especially related to academic integrity. Students could be trained as peer educators on the topic of academic integrity and academic dishonesty prevention strategies. The peer education group could speak to classes, proctor exams, and serve in an advisory capacity to faculty about how to reduce cheating in their classrooms. Also, it might be advisable to involve students more in the resolution of academic dishonesty conduct cases. While they play a part in the UCOD hearings now, I wonder if there is an advantage to amplify their role in some way.

5. Education for Academics/Faculty and Administrative Staff

I recommend creating some symbolic and visible events on campus that would raise awareness and educate faculty, staff and students. Two particular
recommendations are: implement an annual Academic Integrity Week; create and establish annual Academic Integrity Awards. Several campuses have designated Academic Integrity Weeks including University of California Berkeley and Case Western Reserve University. A designated awareness week filled with programs, events, education, and rituals, would add visibility to the issue of academic integrity and garner participation by faculty, students and administrators.

It is my belief that institutions should reward those things that are valued. The second recommendation in this category is to create and establish university awards to recognize faculty, staff and students who have contributed to a culture that values academic integrity. The awards could be presented annually at the existing student leadership awards program.

6. **Education for Students**

There are two recommendations in this category; implement the on-line Academic Integrity Seminar as an educational conduct sanction and also a training tool for hearing boards; examine potential for bLUeprint and bystander intervention to contribute to campus climate related to academic integrity.

The Academic Integrity Seminar (AIS) was developed in 2006 at the University of Maryland as an electronic tool to aid students in their ethical development journey. It is an on-line experience aimed at educating students, training conduct boards, and serving as an educational sanction for conduct violations. Students are assigned an on-line tutor to assist them. The seminar can be completed in 5 to 15 hours and participants are provided with an individual written evaluation of their submitted work. I recommend that the university pilot the AIS as an educational sanction for first time violators of the code of conduct related to academic integrity or
other offenses that relate to ethical behavior. The AIS system is compatible with the university’s student conduct database software which should make implementation of the seminar easy to set up and administer.

There are Dean of Students office committees for both bystander intervention and bLUeprint initiatives. I recommend these committees develop plans over the next three years to address academic integrity issues within the foundational framework of the bLUeprint curriculum and also the bystander intervention program. These two forums reach each student during the course of the university experience, making them efficient and effective venues to communicate and educate.

7. Curriculum Information

In the past 5 years, there have been multiple changes in senior academic leadership on campus, including the President, Provost, and the Academic Deans of the Colleges. I therefore recommend that Lehigh University conduct an environmental scan of course syllabi to determine how often faculty members are including statements related to academic integrity. Perhaps standard language could be developed and embraced as a regular practice.

8. Communication to the General Public

The Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations should develop a standard format and procedure for reporting conduct statistics to the campus. Currently, the reporting frequency is irregular and faculty members provided feedback that the information is not in a format that is readily accessible. Communicating and publicizing the conduct statistics and incidents may help increase awareness of academic integrity issues, and the fact that there is a thoughtful process and outcome when cases are reported.
9. **Process Evaluation**

This is another category that Lehigh University scored 0 points in the 2013 AIRS evaluation. Therefore, I recommend that the student conduct office develop an ongoing mechanism to solicit feedback from faculty, staff and students who participate in the academic dishonesty conduct process. The university is a member of an external assessment organization, Campus Labs, which provides access to other member institutions’ assessment instruments. There are some student conduct process surveys that other institutions are willing to share via Campus Labs that could be adapted for Lehigh University’s use. I recommend that in 2015-16 the university pilot a survey to gather information on students’ and faculty members’ experiences with reporting and participating in the conduct process. Data collected about the process could provide insights for further improvements.

10. **Data Collection**

In addition to the assessment recommendation in the Process Evaluation category, I recommend that the university participate in the NASPA (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) Consortium Student Conduct Study. The study was designed by a group of professionals assigned by NASPA and ASCA (Association for Student Conduct Administrators). This student assessment covers several topics related to conduct processes including outcomes related to the student conduct process and student perceptions of academic integrity. The data set is provided to the school along with data from comparable universities. The study is administered via the Campus Labs software program, which Lehigh University contracts with for assessment efforts.
I also recommend that the university repeat the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS) in three to five years. This is the frequency recommended for institutions that earn a “silver” rating, which is Lehigh University rating on the 2013 AIRS. Presumably and gains made or regressions would be evident in the next rating.

11. Other Recommendations

One final recommendation spans many of the ten AIRS categories. I recommend that the university leadership engage key constituents in a discussion about who is ultimately responsible for academic integrity at Lehigh University. Student Affairs manages the education and outreach to students, oversees the student conduct process, and attempts to engage the campus. But this is one piece of a complex puzzle. Currently, the academic integrity web page is housed on the Provost’s page, which promotes academic integrity as an institutional value. However, several other universities have an Academic Integrity Office or Officer. Having a department named the Academic Integrity Office, or a staff member whose title includes “academic integrity” are visible and symbolic cues to everyone that the institution values academic integrity. That demonstrates the issue is not relegated to the student conduct office where it can be perceived as a reactive measure. It is aspirational rather than responsive. This type of organizational symbolism can assist in creating the campus ethos of integrity.

Conclusion

In 2003, Lehigh University was characterized by a student body that reported cheating at higher than national levels, faculty members who infrequently reported cases of alleged academic dishonesty, and administrators who were fighting an uphill battle to engage the campus in a dialog and understanding of the academic
integrity crisis that was in existence. Two external litmus tests of campuses’
academic integrity culture measured Lehigh University as woefully undeveloped and
indicated that there was much work to do. Drinan’s typology level for Lehigh
University in 2003 was somewhere in-between the “primitive” and “radar screen”
stages. Also according to the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS), in 2003
Lehigh University was rated “bronze”, the lowest level on that rating scale. In 2013,
Lehigh University was characterized as in the “mature” stage of institutional
development in Drinan’s typology, accomplishing one of the main goals of this work.

The 2003 AIRS assessment, combined with a plethora of other data,
provided a good road map of opportunities for strategic interventions and action steps
that would potentially move the institution along the development path towards a
campus climate that more deeply values academic integrity. Twenty four critical
interventions and occurrences are noted in a 12 year timeline (Figure 3.1). These
initiatives combined to enhance and improve the campus climate on multiple
dimensions related to faculty, students’, and administrators’ experiences with
academic integrity.

Ten years following the initial AIRS assessment, Lehigh University
improved to a silver rating by increasing its score by nearly 400% on the rating scale.
Five categories that earned 0 points in 2003, received significant point values in 2013:
education for students, education for academics/faculty/administrators, curriculum
information, communications to the general public, and data collection. Many of the
24 interventions listed in the timeline figure focused on these five categories, and
those efforts reaped results.
Working at the same university (Lehigh University) for the past 26 years, I have had the opportunity to see changes in the campus climate that happened over the course of years, not months. This is a luxury many professionals do not have because the span of their careers often take them to different institutions. Significant progress has been realized in the multi-year effort of this executive position paper project. Certainly not all of the interventions and successes can be attributed to this effort. But at the very least, the information learned during this project contributed to informed, data based decisions during the past several years. In addition, the recommendations provided for the future are based on assessment data and expertise in the field of higher education.

Although college students bear some responsibility for cheating behavior, it is clear that faculty, administrators, and university policies are crucial influences in the establishment of a campus culture that values academic integrity. A campus culture that deeply values integrity can promote an environment where students are less likely to cheat and faculty members are more likely to report incidents when they occur.
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Appendix A

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (ICAI)
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM (AIRS)

Instructions

Completing AIRS
Thank you for taking the time to complete AIRS – the International Center for Academic Integrity’s newest initiative.

You should know that completing AIRS will likely require the efforts of several people on your campus – getting key people on a campus to talk about academic integrity is part of its’ intent! You should not wait to coordinate meetings to gather the information needed for AIRS, rather the majority of it should be collectable via email and the web.

Before you begin AIRS, it is recommended that you contact and partner with key officials, committee, offices, and personnel that are the most knowledgeable about academic integrity data, policies, procedures, responsibilities, and initiatives on your campus. Contacting key people on your campus with an introduction to AIRS that requests information needed will allow them the opportunity to gather and contribute relevant data and materials to the AIRS form.

While each campus is different, our pilot test suggests that it will take 4-6 hours to complete AIRS. The majority of this time will be spent on gathering the required data and supporting documentation. The remaining time will be spent on completing and scoring the form. For further information on scoring and reporting AIRS results, see the sections below.

It is suggested that one person on your campus be the AIRS Key Contact Person so that all information gets sent to him/her for completing and scoring the form (rather than passing the form around to allow people to enter their own information).

Finally, it is suggested that completing AIRS be integrated with campus reaccreditation and recommended that the process be started 5 years prior to reaccreditation.

Scoring AIRS
You have a choice of methods for completing AIRS: Rapid Self-Score and Detailed Self-Score for ICAM Certification. The Rapid Self-Score should be used if you do not have sufficient information or academic integrity activity on campus to complete the detailed report. The Detailed Self-Score should be used if you would like acknowledgment from the ICAI of your effort and a benchmark report that allows you to compare yourself to other institutions.

Rapid Self-Score
Score yourself on primary questions only, giving yourself 50 points for each YES answer (range = 0 – 500 points).
### Detailed Self-Score for ICAM Certification

Score yourself on primary AIMS secondary questions. Primary questions are worth 50 points for each V20 answer. You can earn up to 50 bonus points by answering the secondary questions. Detailed scoring instructions for the secondary questions can be found in the AIBS manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>You are on your way to institutionalizing academic integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>Good Progress</td>
<td>You have implemented many helpful practices on your campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>Good Start</td>
<td>You have recognized academic integrity is important to the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>Get Going!</td>
<td>Time to get more serious about Academic Integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reporting AIBS Results

Once you've completed the Rapid scoring, you can use the chart to report your AIBS results to your ICAI. AIBS scoring must be confirmed by the ICAM after your AIBS form has been reviewed and your documentation checked. Then, ICAI will issue a certificate as well as an explanation if your final, certified score does not match your reported score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic Integrity Refer System</strong> (AERS)</th>
<th><strong>Academic Instructions &amp; Point Values</strong></th>
<th><strong>Your Result</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Our institutional policy in regards to academic integrity is to:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University policies, regulations, and guidelines for academic integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>What qualifies as academic misconduct?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism, cheating, and other forms of academic dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>How do we determine if academic misconduct has occurred?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of student work, evidence collected, and documentation of the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>What type of evidence is needed to prove academic misconduct?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed and specific evidence, such as notes, communication, or coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>What happens if academic misconduct is found?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions, such as failure, suspension, or dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This table outlines the academic integrity framework and the consequences of academic misconduct. It is crucial to understand these policies to avoid violation.

---

**Points:** 100

**Score:** 95
Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ELICITING CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Request for Informed Consent

I agree to participate in a doctoral research investigation of faculty responses to academic dishonesty conducted by Sharon K. Basso, Dean of Students at Lehigh University, and a doctoral degree candidate at the University of Delaware. This research investigation is under the direction of Dr. Barbara Curry, Associate Professor, in the School of Education at the University of Delaware.

I understand that the focus of this investigation is the array of encounters of Lehigh University faculty with instances of cheating, the nature of the faculty members’ responses to cheating, the varying dimensions of those experiences, and the processes faculty members use as they make decisions about how to respond to student cheating.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to (a) gather critical incidents of academic dishonesty from faculty members, experiences, and to (b) analyze faculty members’ hypothetical responses to representative situations. I understand that I am one of sixty participants randomly selected (fifteen from each of the four college faculties at Lehigh University). This investigation employs Flannagan’s critical incident technique in which respondents are asked to describe actual incidents of academic dishonesty in which they have been involved.

I understand that the enclosed questionnaire asks me to describe academic dishonesty situations at Lehigh University of which I have been aware and that the questionnaire may take me 10 minutes to complete. I understand that my responses will at no time contain my name and the questionnaire will not be coded in any way. Two demographic items, gender and academic rank, are included in the questionnaire. The results of the study will be reported in the aggregate, not individually. I understand that all data will be stored in “double-locked” files and will be destroyed six years following publication of the study. Only the investigator will have access to the secured data. I understand that if I withdraw from the study my data will be destroyed immediately. I understand that the risks to me are minimal but may include discomfort from recalling potentially disturbing incidents of academic dishonesty. Further, I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me for participating, but that the findings from this research may improve understanding of faculty responses to academic dishonesty at Lehigh University.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that I may elect not to respond to any question with no penalty or loss. I further understand that if I have any questions about this study I may contact the investigator, Sharon K. Basso, by phone at (610) 758-4156 or via mail at University Center Room 108. When the investigator’s degree is completed, the results of this research will be available by obtaining a copy of the published dissertation titled, “Academic Dishonesty at Lehigh University: Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions Inform Institutional Policy”.

As this is a jointly approved investigation at both Lehigh University and The University of Delaware, where the investigator is a doctoral student, I may report any problems that result from my participation in this study to Ruth L. Tallman, Office of Research, and Sponsored Programs, Lehigh University, (610)-758-3024, and/or Dr. T. W. Fraser Russell, Vice Provost for Research, 210 Hullihen Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-1551, phone (302) 831-2136.

As with any survey research, this study is dependent on a high rate of return, and I understand that my participation is valued and appreciated. By initialing each page and signing below, I agree to participate in this study.
Faculty Critical Incident Questionnaire

Demographic Information:

1. Gender: (circle one) Male Female

2. Faculty Rank: (circle one) Assistant Professor Associate Professor Full Professor Adjunct Faculty Other

Critical Incidents:

3. Please describe below any incidents (up to three total incidents) in which you were aware of an academic dishonesty situation (student cheating) at Lehigh University. These may have been incidents with: (a) a positive or negative outcome, (b) situations in which you formally reported an incident, (c) situations when you handled an incident on your own, or (d) situations you were aware of but did not respond. Describe each incident in detail using care not to reveal any names of individuals involved.

4. If you have never been aware of any cheating incidents at Lehigh University, please check here and return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed white envelope. _______

Incident #1:

a. Describe incident in detail using back of sheet if necessary (use no real names of individuals involved).

b. Please describe any and all steps you may have taken in responding to this incident.

Incident #1: (continued)

c. How did you feel about this incident?
d. What effect do you think the incident and its resolution had upon the student(s) involved and your class or program?

Incident #2:

a. Describe a second incident in detail using back of sheet if necessary (use no real names of individuals involved).

b. Please describe any and all steps you may have taken in responding to this incident.

c. How did you feel about this incident?

d. What effect do you think the incident and its resolution had upon the student(s) involved and your class or program?

Incident #3:

a. Describe a third incident in detail using the back of the page if necessary (use no real names of individuals involved).

b. Please describe any and all steps you may have taken in responding to this incident.

c. How did you feel about this incident?

d. What effect do you think the incident and its resolution had upon the student(s) involved and your class or program?
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SELECTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS FROM LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Sorting instructions for judges:

Please sort the following incidents of academic dishonesty into categories that reflect your understanding of the differences among them. You can sort the incidents into as many or as few categories that make sense to you.

1. A student plagiarized from the Wall Street Journal book review section and handed it in as his/her own work.

2. A student gave his friend all of his tests from a class he took last semester to use because his friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor doesn’t change his exams from year to year.

3. A student completed an assigned paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering it up with a sheet of paper when he sat at a computer to compose his own paper. The student then proofread his paper and compared it to the source article. If it sounded like too close of a match, he revised his paper again. The finished product was very similar to the original source. The student said his high school priest taught him that this was the way to write a paper.

4. Two students handed in identical work on a project and indicated that they did work together on the assignment but claimed that each did their own final write up. However, the papers were identical and the instructor suspects they were disc copies.

5. A student turned in a paper plagiarized, in part, from a website. The student admitted to the plagiarism but indicated it was only part of the paper that was copied.
6. Two students turned in very similar papers. They admitted discussing the assignment, sources, and how to write the paper ahead of time. But both students said they wrote their own papers independently after these discussions.

7. A student copied material and presented it as her own work when she submitted the paper. She did not use any citations for the paper and the text included direct quotes from sources. The student said she did not mean to misrepresent the work as her own, but she didn’t know she had to cite such things.

8. A student turned in a paper with no references of source material she used, representing the paper as her original work. She had used websites and did not cite the source. She apologized and was embarrassed to face the professor.

9. A student in a very large undergraduate class took the final exam on behalf of another student.

10. A graduate student used additional handwritten material in an open book test. The student was international and English was his second language. He indicated that he didn’t understand the directions and wasn’t aware that he couldn’t use his notes. The instructor didn’t believe that explanation because there were other ESL students in the class that clearly understood the directions.

11. Students copied from each other on homework problem solutions and turned them in as their own work.

12. Two students submitted identical computer files as solutions to an assignment, but each student had their own name on the file they turned in.

13. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One student complained to the faculty member about the absence of one of the group members from their meetings. It was clear that one of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

14. Two students submitted identical computer programs as homework assignments, including the same student’s name appearing on both programs.
15. Two students had identical answers to questions on a final exam. The students indicated that they had studied together for the exam and that is why their answers were similar.

16. Two students handed in computer programs with had sections of code in them that appeared to be copies. The names of the variables were different, but the code was identical in portions of their programs.

17. A student was caught with their notebook open and referring to notes during a quiz.

18. During an exam, a student had her own notes mixed in with the pages of the exam and was observed using them.

19. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

20. One group of student plagiarized from another group on a team final report.

21. A student turned in, as their own work, a paper they purchased on the internet.

22. Two similar, but different, final exams were handed out randomly to the class. A student handed in an exam containing answers to the exam which he did not take.

23. After an exam was graded and handed back to students, a student brought his exam to the professor and said that he had answered two questions correctly but did not receive credit for them. The student had erased his original graded answer and changed it before asking the professor to review it for credit.

24. On an exam, a student answered a question that was inconsistent with the calculations she did in the work that preceded that question. The instructor assert that the student could not have arrived at the correct answer based on her own calculations. The student said she did mental calculations in her head to arrive at the answer.

25. A student paid another student to take a final exam on their behalf.

26. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with similar sections of code in both programs. The students worked together on the
homework assignment because they were allowed to discuss it. One student provided the other student with their finished homework to look at before that student finished his own assignment.

27. One student took a printout of another student’s computer programming homework assignment from the computer in his room and used it to copy from when he worked on his own homework. The student was not aware that his program had been taken.

28. A student plagiarized portions of his final paper by not using quotation marks in some sections that were direct quotes from a source. In other sections that were directly taken from a source, he did not use quotation marks and also provided a different source for the material in his reference section. The instructor concluded that the student was attempting to appear to have done more extensive research than he did by listing multiple sources when it was clear he had used only one source for the paper.

29. A student copied sections of his final research paper from a website source and did not cite the source, representing the work as his own.

30. A student copied information from a website and turned it in as his own work when he submitted his take home final exam. The student indicated he only did this on one out of four questions.

31. Three students submitted identical computer program homework assignments. They indicated that they thought they were allowed to work together on the assignment and didn’t believe they crossed the line from collaboration to copying.

32. A student handed in a paper with significant portions of it taken from a website gradesaver.com without citing the web source. The professor had warned the student that his rough drafts did not look like his own work before he handed the final plagiarized paper in.

33. A student submitted a paper that he did not write. He obtained the paper from a friend at another university and represented it as his own work.
34. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

35. A student turned in an exam for re-grading after the professor handed them back to the class. The professor had made a copy of the graded exams before he returned them to students. When he compared the one handed back in by the student for re-grading with the copy of the student’s exam that was turned back to him, it was clear that four answers had been changed. The student acknowledged that the answers appear to have been changed, but was adamant that he did not do so. He provided several faculty letters of reference about his character and support from these faculty that they believed his account of the situation.

36. A student copied another student’s homework assignment and turned it in as his own. He took the other student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission and copied it.

37. During an exam, a student referred to their notes which was not permitted. The student had handwritten notes on a copy of the Brown and White newspaper and viewed the cheat sheet during the exam.

38. A student copied answers from another student’s exam while sitting next to him during the midterm.

39. A student received text messages on his cell phone from another student in the class during an exam. The messages provided answers to questions on the exam.

40. A student stole a copy of a final exam from a professor’s office the day before the exam was administered and used this information to study for the exam. He also provided the stolen exam to other students to use the night before.

41. A professor provides samples of a lab notebook for students to look so they can get a sense of what a good lab notebook entails. One student took one of these sample lab
books (the work of a student in a previous semester) and changed the name and submitted it to the professor as his own lab notebook.

42. A graduate student provided false data in the research portion of their doctoral dissertation.

43. A student copied material and presented it as his own work in a paper submitted near the end of the semester. The student indicated that they were stressed and anxious to get home because a week prior to the paper deadline they were in a fight and struck in the face.
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CRITICAL INCIDENT FINAL NINE EDITED SCENARIOS

1. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

2. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

3. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room.

4. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

5. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

6. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

7. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

8. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

9. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.
Appendix E

PAIRED COMPARISON AND BI-POLAR SCALE SURVEY

FACULTY SURVEY

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please mark your personal data with an X

1. Gender: ______ Male ______ Female
2. Faculty Rank: _____ Assistant Professor _____ Associate Professor
   ______ Full Professor ______ Adjunct Faculty ______ Other

II. PAIRED COMPARISONS FOR CHEATING INCIDENTS

Directions: Following are incidents of cheating (academic dishonesty) which occurred at
Lehigh University as reported by Lehigh University faculty members in a previous survey.
Please read each item pair carefully and consider how similar the two situations are to one
another. Then rate each presented pair according to how similar or different they are using
whatever dimensions of the situations you consider to be important. For each presented
pair, mark an X directly over the place on the scaled line corresponding to your judgment of
the degree of similarity or difference. Please answer all 36 questions. Do not skip any
questions.

EXAMPLE OF MARKING THE SCALE

Very Similar [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Very Different
Question 1.
A. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

B. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

Question 2.
A. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

B. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

Question 3.
A. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

B. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

Question 4.
A. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

B. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he
revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

Question 5.
A. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

B. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

Question 6.
A. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

B. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

Question 7.
A. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

B. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.
Question 8.
A. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

B. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

Question 9.
A. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

B. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

Question 10.
A. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

B. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

Question 11.
A. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.
B. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the
class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t
change his exams from year to year.

Very Similar       | Very Different

Question 12.
A. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the
three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

B. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the
source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

Very Similar       | Very Different

Question 13.
A. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

B. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

Very Similar       | Very Different

Question 14.
A. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

B. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.
Question 15.
A. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

B. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

Question 16.
A. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

B. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

Question 17.
A. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

B. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.
Question 18.
A. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

B. A student took another student's homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

Very Similar  |            | Very Different

Question 19.
A. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

B. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

Very Similar  |            | Very Different

Question 20.
A. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

B. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

Very Similar  |            | Very Different

Question 21.
A. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.
B. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

Very Similar | Very Different

Question 22.
A. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

B. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

Very Similar | Very Different

Question 23.
A. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

B. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

Very Similar | Very Different

Question 24.
A. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

B. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.
Question 25.
A. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

B. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

Question 26.
A. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

B. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

Question 27.
A. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

B. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

Question 28.
A. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

B. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own
paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

Very Similar  | Very Different

Question 29.
A. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

B. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

Very Similar  | Very Different

Question 30.
A. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

B. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

Very Similar  | Very Different

Question 31.
A. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

B. A student took another student's homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

Very Similar  | Very Different
**Question 32.**
A. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

B. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.

**Question 33.**
A. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

B. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.

**Question 34.**
A. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

B. A student paid another student to take his final exam.

**Question 35.**
A. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.
B. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

Very Similar  |  Very Different

Question 36.
A. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.

B. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

Very Similar  |  Very Different

III. BIPOLAR RATING SCALE FOR CHEATING INCIDENTS

Please read each of the nine items below carefully and think about how you would feel, respond, and/or act if you were presented with that scenario in one of the courses you teach at Lehigh University. Consider the dimensions provided after each incident description and mark an X directly on the place on the scaled line corresponding to your response in that situation. Please be careful to answer all questions.

EXAMPLE OF MARKING THE SCALES:

SERIOUS  |  MINOR

1. A student submitted a paper which included direct quotes. She did not use any citations. The student said she did not mean to represent the work as her own, but didn’t know she had to cite such things.
2. A student copied half of his paper from other sources and failed to cite any of them, representing the work as his own.
3. A student used a cheat sheet during a test by going to the rest room to look at it.

SERIOUS: MINOR
UNINTENTIONAL: DELIBERATE
CLEAR: AMBIGUOUS
ATTRIBUTE TO STUDENT: ATTRIBUTE TO SITUATION
NO SANCTION WARRANTED: EXPULSION WARRANTED
HANDLE MYSELF: REFER TO UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON DISCIPLINE

4. A student gave his friend the tests from a class he took last semester. His friend had the class now with the same professor. Both students had heard that this instructor didn’t change his exams from year to year.

SERIOUS: MINOR
UNINTENTIONAL: DELIBERATE
CLEAR: AMBIGUOUS
5. A student wrote a paper by reading a source material article, then physically covering the source article up with a sheet of paper when he sat at the computer to compose his own paper. If he thought his paper sounded too close of a match to the source article, he revised his paper. The student said his high school teacher taught him this method for writing papers.

6. Two students turned in computer programming homework assignments with identical sections of code in both programs. The students were permitted to work together on the homework assignment.
7. A student paid another student to take his final exam.
8. A student took another student’s homework assignment without his knowledge/permission, copied it, and turned it in as his own work.

SERIOUS

UNINTENTIONAL

CLEAR

ATTRIBUTE TO STUDENT

NO SANCTION WARRANTED

HANDLE MYSELF

MINOR

DELIBERATE

AMBIGUOUS

ATTRIBUTE TO SITUATION

EXPULSION WARRANTED

REFER TO UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON DISCIPLINE

9. Three students were in an assigned group working together on a project. One of the three did not participate in the project but placed his name on the final product.

SERIOUS

UNINTENTIONAL

CLEAR

ATTRIBUTE TO STUDENT

MINOR

DELIBERATE

AMBIGUOUS

ATTRIBUTE TO SITUATION
Thank you for completing the survey. Please return in the enclosed envelope to Sharon K. Basso, 29 Trembley Drive, UC Room 108, Bethlehem, PA 18015.
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LEHIGH UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY AND REPORT 2003

Is Lehigh Ready for an Honor Code?
Submitted on Behalf of Student Senate XV
by the Research and Academic Committees
April 8, 2003

Throughout the duration of Senate XV the Academic and Research Committees have been working hard to come up with a recommendation as to how Lehigh University should proceed in regards to the issue of academic dishonesty. The Academic Committee has researched Lehigh’s current situation in regards to how
cheating is tolerated and conducted a survey to measure students’ perceptions of this issue. Also, the Research Committee has looked into how similar universities and colleges treat their cases of dishonesty. As a whole, we have looked into the ways in which a true Honor Code works and have weighed the pros and cons of such a program. As research has shown, however, it is clear that Lehigh University is currently not prepared to implicate an Honor Code.

Several colleges and universities with similar stature to that of Lehigh do employ Honor Codes in their traditional form. In addition, several of these schools reported many benefits to such a program- the most prominent being the sense of freedom they felt that it brought to the students and faculty. Although the majority of schools were pleased with the ways in which the program served their needs, some of the schools had recently begun conducting reviews of their Honor Code and its effectiveness. Duke was one such school and published results questioning the benefits of using an Honor Code. Of those polled as to whether or not the Honor Code at Duke was effective, 62% said that it was ineffective. In the same survey, an overwhelming 90% felt that the chance of a student getting caught was “low” or “very low.” This demonstrates that although there are several positive aspects which result from an Honor Code that they are not always as effective as administrators hope them to be.

The idea behind an Honor Code is that students welcome the thought of taking it upon themselves to see that all work done by their peers is their own. This requires trust among each other, the system, and the inherent belief that cheating of any kind is wrong. Attached is a copy of the survey which the Academic Committee distributed among Lehigh students. These results imply that Lehigh students may not have the attitude necessary to successfully implement an Honor Code. The survey asked 5 questions and asked students to rate their answers on a scale from 0 to 10- 0 being they do not agree with the statement and 10 that they strongly agree. In addition, graphs have been attached which detail how the questions were answered. The first question asked to what extent the student believed cheating to be an issue at Lehigh. By examining figure one, the distribution of answers can be seen. The number which most felt represented the cheating problem at Lehigh was a 3, with a little over 200 people selecting this response. The average response was 3.91, only approximately a point higher than the mode. This leaves us with one of two answers: (1) that cheating is not a problem at our campus or (2) that the students are so comfortable with cheating that they no longer see it as a problem. In addition the survey concluded that copying homework was the most common instance of cheating. Also, the students cheated most frequently when they had a heavy workload.
The answer to the first question tells us more than anything. It is hard to believe that cheating is not a problem at Lehigh (otherwise we would not have taken up this responsibility to draft this recommendation), which means that students at Lehigh have become immune to the fact that cheating is wrong. This means that if an Honor Code was implemented that the students would not be able to take it seriously since they don’t believe that cheating is wrong to begin with. To even consider having an Honor Code Lehigh would first required instilling a better sense of respect among students and the work which they do.

A large part of an Honor Code depends on the emphasis which professors put on seeing it through all the way. As seen with the example of Duke, many teachers fail to report violators to the Judicial Council because they feel it is a hassle. This is not just a problem at Duke; Donald McCabe conducted reviews on faculty perspectives on Honor Codes and discovered that, “55% of faculty ‘would not be willing to devote any real effort to documenting suspected incidents of student cheating.’” As a professor in San Luis Obispo said, “With respect to cheating, I’m just in denial. I just don’t want to deal with it because I know it’s a huge problem.” In order to have an effective system, the professors need to be as equally interested in solving the problem as the students and administrators. Without full support from the faculty in carrying out the procedures, an Honor Code would be a meaningless piece of paper. Judging by the responses from the Duke survey and the information from other professors, the majority are unwilling to devote the time and energy to implement a successful program.

Therefore, based on the ideas that an Honor Code requires and the preexisting sentiments of faculty and students alike, such a step is premature in solving Lehigh’s academic dishonesty issue. Rather, we recommend that we work with the preexisting system to fix the problems within before attempting to implement an Honor Code. In order to strengthen our program it is essential to urge the professors and teaching assistants to become more actively involved in fighting cheating in all forms. Professors can do small things that have big impacts on students. Simply put, addressing the issue of cheating and its repercussions in the beginning of the semester helps students to know that the professor has taken an active interest in catching academic dishonesty. In addition, taking the time to create different versions of tests, following the outlined procedures when dealing with a suspected violator, as well as sufficiently monitoring examinations will hopefully send the message to students that cheating is not tolerated at Lehigh. Through these actions we may prepare the campus for an Honor Code, if that is still the desire for this campus.
Academic Integrity Survey

(1) On a scale from 0-10, (0 meaning you do not think it is a problem and 10 meaning it is a very big problem) how big of a problem is cheating here at Lehigh? 

_____

(2) Please rate on a scale from 0-10 (0 meaning you do not think this form of cheating is a problem and 10 meaning you think it is a severe problem) the severity of each cheating problem here at Lehigh:

_____ Copying answers from another student’s test
_____ Using cheat sheets
_____ Copying homework
_____ Turning in another student’s old paper or a paper from the Internet
_____ Getting answers about the test from another student, for example someone who has previously taken the test.

Other:
__________________________________________________________________

(3) On a scale from 0-10 (0 meaning the factor does not contribute and 10 meaning the factor contributes heavily) please rate which factors you think contribute the most to the likelihood of someone cheating

_____ A class with heavy workload
_____ A class that is for your major
_____ A non-essential elective
_____ A large lecture class
_____ A small lecture class
_____ A class where you do not like the professor
_____ A class where you like the professor
_____ In a class where you know other students are cheating

Other factors:
__________________________________________________________________

(4) On a scale from 0-10 (0 being not likely and 10 being very likely) what do you think is the likelihood of being caught for cheating? _______

(5) On a scale from 0-10 (0 being not likely and 10 being very likely) what do you think is the likelihood of being punished if caught for cheating? _______
(6) What is the most severe punishment you think you would receive if you or someone else were caught cheating?

(7) What class are you: (circle one) Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

(8) What school are you in: (circle one) Engineering Business Arts/Sciences

Any additional comments about any issue relating to cheating at Lehigh:

Survey Results

Figure 1: Distribution of the answers to survey question 1, on a scale from 0-10, (0 meaning you do not think it is a problem and 10 meaning it is a very big problem) how big of a problem is cheating here at Lehigh?
Figure 2: Average answers to survey question 2.

Figure 3: Average answers to survey question 3.
Appendix G

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE STATEMENTS

Lehigh University Undergraduate Student Senate Statement on Academic Integrity
We, the Lehigh University Student Senate, as the standing representative body of all undergraduates, reaffirm the duty and obligation of students to meet and uphold the highest principles and values of personal, moral and ethical conduct. As partners in our educational community, both students and faculty share the responsibility for promoting and helping to ensure an environment of academic integrity. As such, each student is expected to complete all academic course work in accordance to the standards set forth by the faculty and in compliance with the University's Code of Conduct.

Lehigh University Graduate Student Senate Statement on the University's Code of Conduct
We, the representatives of the Lehigh University Graduate Senate, affirm our commitment to an intellectual community in which undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and staff share an obligation to uphold the highest standards of personal, professional, and academic integrity. In this partnership, we recognize our unique, multifaceted role as students, teaching assistants, research assistants, and graduate assistants. As such, each graduate student has a responsibility to fulfill his or her duties in accordance with the standards set forth by the faculty and in compliance with the University’s Code of Conduct.
Appendix H

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY STUDENT LIFE CURRICULUM: bLUeprint 2013

**Student Life Curriculum – A Step by Step Process**

**Step 1: Directly connect to institutional mission, vision, and values.**

- Goal # 3: Providing a Best-in-Class Experience: Promoting Student Success through Core Competencies and Student Engagement
  
  o **“Lehigh staff members are committed to making the living environment a learning environment for undergraduate and graduate students. They enrich the learning experience and make our research and teaching productive. They are educators in the broad sense and they add a dimension to Lehigh that creates the feeling of family, not an institution.”**
  
  o **“Lehigh University is among those few institutions that have an opportunity to provide a unique higher education by combining the research university with the student-centered residential college.”**
  
  o **“We envision engaging every undergraduate and graduate student through new pedagogies inside and outside the classroom. We find inspiration and excitement in tackling grand challenges in the research laboratory, classroom, seminar, and residence.”**
  
  o **“Residential education means that students have opportunities to learn from their faculty, staff, and peers in structured classroom settings, their living environment, and other venues throughout campus. It is our goal today to further enhance this distinguishing quality of a Lehigh education while preparing for changes in the student body and the world in which they will live and work.”**
  
  o **“We aspire to an environment where the academic and living experiences merge into an integrated learning experience. Students succeed in such an environment when they exhibit mastery of a body of knowledge and**
acquisition of essential cognitive, developmental, and interpersonal competencies.”

Step 2: Learning outcomes are derived from a defined educational priority. These are broad educational terms such as leadership or citizenship

- The Core Competency Map (2009) has undergone a slight revision, and the curriculum is intended to be the way in which the DOS staff operationalizes the Core Competencies. The Core Competencies, as written in the university strategic plan, will continue to serve as the backdrop for our work. However, the bLUeprint is the ‘face’ of the core competencies introduced to students. Conceptually, the five learning outcomes of the curriculum, or the Five Foundations for Success, represent the concepts of the Core Competencies with the addition of Professional Growth & Success.
  - Intellectual Development=> Creative Curiosity
  - Individual Identity Development=> Identity Development
  - Interpersonal Development, Equity, Community & Global Engagement=> Collaborative Connections & Inclusive Leadership
- Our committee chose the term ‘bLUeprint’ as student-friendly language to engage students in the Five Foundations for Success. This term describes the mapping process that students will use to intentionally design their Lehigh experience, drawing from opportunities offered by our offices. Within their chosen learning opportunities, students will explore the Five Foundations and receive coaching from a multitude of college resources, creating their own unique pathway through and toward a personally meaningful Lehigh experience.
- We solicited input from staff broadly through a survey to assist us with this narrowing process, and we have spent time reviewing the Lehigh Core Values because they resonate closely with the Core Competencies. The learning outcomes are closely related to the Lehigh Core Values. Therefore providing even more connection to the larger university mission and purpose.
  - Several of the aspirations derived from the core values include: Intellectual Curiosity, Integrity and Honesty, Equitable Community, Collaboration, and Leadership
- In addition, our committee spent two meetings reviewing assessment data and current demographic and developmental information about current Lehigh students as a committee and with the help of Institutional Research. This information will help us continue to think about the most important competencies and learning outcomes.
The committee finalized the five learning outcomes or Five Foundations for Success:

- **Creative Curiosity**: Students will ask big questions, seek mindful solutions, and develop an overall inquisitive outlook on the world.
- **Identity Development**: Students will continue to develop into their own unique person, become grounded in their multiple identities, and live out their carefully chosen values and beliefs.
- **Collaborative Connections**: Students will learn to build positive relationships and engage in dialogue, utilizing their personal values, and inquisitive outlook as a guide.
- **Inclusive Leadership**: Students will make decisions, take action, and contribute positively to their communities in ways that are purposeful, socially just, and built on integrity.
- **Professional Growth & Success**: Students will utilize their intellectual passions and talents to create and enact a personal definition of success that positively represents themselves, their profession, and their communities.

Learning process involves a four phase, basic to advanced developmental path. These four steps are Discover, Explore, Connect, and Apply. This process can be applied broadly across the Lehigh undergraduate experience as a whole, within a particular academic year, or within particular learning experiences across offices. Ultimately, we want our team to know and use these terms in their work so that students can apply this process to their own lives and practice driving their own learning.

In addition, our committee spent two meetings reviewing assessment data and current demographic and developmental information about current Lehigh students as a committee and with the help of Institutional Research. This information will help us continue to think about the most important competencies and capacities that the curriculum should focus on in promoting student learning.

**Step 3: Connect to current research and select developmental theory.**

- Our committee spent time reviewing many different student development theories in order to select 1-2 that would most resonate with our core competency model and the learning we hope to promote through the curriculum.
- We have selected one theory and two models of practice to guide our curricular approach, combining theory and practice in both concept and implementation. These include:
  - **Self-Authorship Theory – Dr. Baxter Magolda**
Definition: “The capacity to internally define a coherent belief system and identity that coordinates engagement in mutual relations with the larger world”; “The ability to know yourself, know what you know, reflect upon it, and base judgments on it”

Can be directly tied to the Core Competencies

- Three dimensions → LU core competency
  - Epistemological/Cognitive → intellectual
  - Interpersonal → interpersonal
  - Intrapersonal → individual identity

Four phases of Self-Authorship

- Following Formulas – Allow others to define them, doing what authorities suggest, following guidance from others to be successful
- Crossroads – Dissatisfaction with others’ definitions, see that following does not always work, but not yet able to act on desire to be more autonomous
- Becoming the Author of One’s Life – Ability to choose one’s beliefs and live them out (not without challenges), some renegotiation of relationships, weighing their needs against others’

Internal Foundations – Individuals become grounded in the sense of who they are, develop a mutuality of relationships, recognize that ambiguity and external influences exists, and base life decisions on a strong inner core of beliefs and self-concept

- Learning Partnerships Model – Baxter Magolda
  - Three principles:
    - Learners = constructors of knowledge (Cognitive)
    - Learning based in personal experience (Intrapersonal)
    - Mutually constructing meaning with experts and peers (Interpersonal)
  - Three assumptions of learning:
    - Knowledge = complex & socially constructed (Cognitive)
    - Identity plays a role in constructing knowledge (Intrapersonal)
    - Knowledge = mutually constructed via sharing of experiences (Interpersonal)
Social Change Model of Leadership Development

- Provides a framework for leadership that does not necessitate a person holding a traditional leadership role or position, but rather focuses on any person who desires to make positive change
- Goals of the model:
  - To enhance student learning and development by enhancing each students’ self-knowledge and capacity for leadership in relation to working with others
- The model examines leadership development from three different perspectives:
  - The Individual: What personal qualities are we attempting to foster and develop in those who participate in leadership development activities? What personal qualities are most supportive of group functioning and positive social change?
  - The Group: How can the collaborative leadership development process be designed not only to facilitate the development of the desired individual qualities (above) but also to effect positive social change for a group?
  - The Community/Society: Toward what social ends is the leadership development activity directed? What kinds of service activities are most effective in energizing the group and in developing desired personal qualities in the individual?
- The seven C’s of Leadership that lead to Change:
  - Consciousness of self
  - Congruence
  - Commitment
  - Collaboration
  - Common Purpose
  - Controversy with Civility
  - Citizenship

Step 4: Learning outcomes drive development of educational strategies
We also drafted a set of programmatic learning outcomes that will be achieved through the implementation of a curricular model of learning. These outcomes are listed below:

Our Student Life Curriculum will:

- Directly flow from and provide clear support to the University and Divisional values and goals.
- Serve as the updated, student-friendly version of the Core Competencies which the Division will adopt over the 2013-2014 academic year.
- Provide clearly determined methods for achieving stated learning outcomes as well as pre-determined measurements for assessing overall effectiveness and student learning.
- Offer creative and engaging delivery strategies that generate student excitement and engagement.
- Be recognizable and understandable by all students living on campus beginning on First Year Move-In day and carrying through their entire experience on campus.
- Ensure that all professional and student staff has the appropriate training, confidence, and excitement about their role in the implementation of the program.
- Further enable the Offices of Residence Life and Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, as well as the larger University to clearly articulate the value of living on campus and participating in co-curricular opportunities to enhance their learning.
- Serve as a cornerstone program linking students’ residence hall and Greek living experiences, as well as providing support during the transition from one to the other.
- Be designed in a way that creates some common experiences among all students of a particular class, but also celebrates the distinctiveness of different types of living experiences (i.e., Greek houses, Live Lehigh groups, faculty-in-residence programs, etc.)
- Be implemented in an intentional and inclusive way that facilitates early and sustainable buy-in from campus partners, allows for natural ties between different departments across campus and meets both the educational needs of students and the desired educational outcomes of departments across campus.
• Provide significant opportunities for students to assume leadership roles and play an integral part in the implementation of the overall curriculum

Step 5: Determine and categorize specific strategies to accomplish learning outcomes
• Created a process for ORL, OFYE, and OFSA learning strategy development to accomplish learning outcomes
• Spring 2012, the ORL, OFYE, and OFSA redesigned 18 learning strategies (current and new) to be in line with the Student Life Curriculum, including its theoretical underpinnings: self-authorship and the social change model. Toward this end, learning strategies were further brought into alignment with learning-centered practice and a curricular approach.
  o OFSA: Pre-Recruitment Efforts (new), Bro Gamma Training (new), Rho Gamma Training, New Member Educator Training (new), Accreditation, and Chapter President and Assistant Director 1:1 Conversations
  o OFYE: evoLUtion Seminar, OL/OC Recruitment and Selection, 5 x 10 (formerly the First Six Program), Reflective Journal (new), Orientation, Gryphon Training
  o ORL: Community Development & Programming, Community Meetings & Gryphon/Resident Conversations (new), Gryphon and Assistant Director 1:1 Conversations (new), Gryphon Evaluations, Gryphon Recruitment and Selection, Gryphonship
• The committee will decide upon collaborative learning strategies to be implemented in the fall of 2013. A subcommittee will devote time and attention to this particular aim.
• The Campus Labs Curriculums function will be investigated as a means to promote learning outcomes and student engagement with the Curriculum.

Step 6: Plan is presented to appropriate leadership for feedback and critique
• Overall concept presented for feedback and adoption as part of Residential Living Appreciative Inquiry Process in March 2012
• Curriculum concept and theory presented to DOS team during the May 2012 retreat.
• SLC presented to DOS Expanded Leadership Team and Vice-Provost of Student Affairs in February 2013 for feedback
• SLC/bLUeprint presented to Board of Trustees in May 2013
• August DOS retreat will roll-out the details of bLUeprint as well as process for transforming learning strategies.

Step 7: Determine process of transition from current delivery methods to curriculum model
• Fall 2012: Transition Director of Student Life Curriculum and Residential Staff Development and outline committee progress.
  o Determine learning outcomes (see step 2)
  o Determine learning process (see step 2)
  o Train staff to realign current learning strategies with curriculum/learning approach
• Spring 2013:
  o Explore potential collaborative strategies
  o Realign departmental learning strategies
  o Develop marketing strategy, SLC name (i.e., bLUeprint) and brochure with Linda Harbrecht in University Communications
• Summer 2013:
  o Determine collaborative strategies
  o Determine assessment for chosen collaborative strategies
  o Investigate the technology layer for engaging students in the Curriculum
  o Create a plan to engage key stakeholders in 2013-2014
  o Develop professional staff and student staff resources for transitioning to a curricular approach
  o Realign staff training to be in alignment with the SLC; implement staff training in preparation for 2013-2014 (OFYE, ORL, and OFYE) and beyond
• August 2013: Curriculum presented to DOS staff and will take a full academic year cycle to complete transition in all DOS offices. SLC committee and Director of SLC will be a resource and guide throughout this process.
• SLC will be implemented in fall 2013 for ORL, OFYE, and OFSA.
• Fall 2013: SLC committee will be composed of four sub-committees: Macro-Level Planning, Collaborative Strategies, Assessment, and Technology. Original SLC committee will expand to include additional members of the Dean of Students staff.

Step 8: Stakeholders are identified and involved
• Key stakeholders have been involved since the inception of the curriculum idea including Residence Life, Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, First Year Experience, and the DOS Leadership Team.
• The August 2013 DOS retreat will be facilitated by the committee and outline the shift to the curriculum model and stakeholder office transitions.
• Board of Trustees was involved at the May 2013 meeting.
• Once foundational plans are in place, a steering committee will be formed with additional key stakeholders.

**Step 9: Annual review of plan that includes feedback, critique, and transparency**
• This will be done by the steering committee as well as individual departments such as Residence Life and Fraternity and Sorority Affairs.

**Additional Notes:**
• The step-by-step plan for implementation does not include a step that focuses on examining staffing needs, infrastructure adjustments, budgetary considerations, etc. to support the implementation of the plan. Our committee has started discussing some of these items and will continue to over the summer months.
• On some campuses, the implementation of an initiative such as this is done solely via committee. On other campuses, a staff member has been designated to coordinate the overall efforts across departments or specifically within Residence Life.
• We have proposed and are currently working on approval for a hybrid approach for Lehigh.
  o In this approach, we would designate approximately half of a staff member’s effort toward oversight, coordination, and assessment of the Student Life Curriculum.
  o The largest responsibility of this staff member related to the Curriculum would be to serve as the facilitator for a Division-wide steering committee charged with the ongoing implementation of the curriculum within our residential facilities.
  o In addition, this staff member would work in the Residence Life Department helping staff to implement the curriculum within the Residence Halls and would be responsible for areas related to student staff recruitment, selection, and training.
  o Rationale: The Dean of Students Office has success with shared positions that have some dual supervision responsibilities and projects in multiple areas of the DOS department (i.e. Assistant Director for Greek Leadership...
Development, Director of Athletic Academic Initiatives, Director of Athletic Leadership Programs, etc.). Often this approach within the Lehigh environment has led to enhanced buy-in, collaboration, and new perspectives for the areas involved while requiring more modest resources. We believe this success can be replicated with this position directly supporting the needs of Residence Life and also working with the offices participating in the curriculum.

- In addition, the proposal of this hybrid model for staff support is one that is affordable and more palatable for the University, rather than requesting the addition of a brand new position at this juncture in the development of the curriculum.

- Our committee has spent significant time discussing the pros/cons to using varying language to describe this initiative. This has included asking questions about both the words “Residential” and “Curriculum.” After hearing all of these various perspectives, the Student Affairs leadership has come to the following conclusions that are now guiding our committee’s work.

  - We will move in the direction of expanding beyond the term “residential” though we are very clear that majority of this program will occur within residences on campus and that this curriculum is the primary vehicle through which we will communicate about the value of living on campus.

  - By using the term “student life”, it will be easier to encourage buy-in and participation from critical offices such as Academic Support, First Year Experience, etc. In addition, by not labeling it as solely about a students’ “residential” experience it facilitates a ”blurring of the lines” and a “connection of the dots” between students residential, academic, social, and involvement experiences on campus. Our overall goal is to reinforce key learning goals and delivery methods across multiple aspects of a student’s experience rather than perpetuate the notion that a particular skill such as “integrity” is taught and practiced only in one’s residential space, but is not as essential in other circles they are part of on campus. Furthermore, the term “student life” has had much success when used to create buy-in and collaboration on campus, and our hope will be to build on such momentum.

  - At this point for ease purposes, we have selected to stick with the word “curriculum,” at least behind the scenes.
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LEHIGH UNIVERSITY SANCTIONING GUIDELINES

Guidelines for sanctions in cases Academic Dishonesty. (added June 2008) Students found responsible for violations of the Code of Conduct related to academic integrity, are subject to expulsion or other lesser penalties as outlined in Article VII of the code. The following represents recommendations for minimum sanctions in these cases. These sanctions demonstrate the seriousness that Lehigh University attaches to these types of violations. Academic integrity violations constitute intellectual fraud and should result in serious sanctions. Hearing panels are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction, but any deviation from these suggested sanctions should be justified, especially when considering sanctions less than the minimum. Hearing panels may supplement the sanctions below with other appropriate mandates including, but not limited to, educational workshops, completion of work for no credit, written apologies, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MINIMUM PRIMARY SANCTION</th>
<th>MINIMUM SECONDARY SANCTION</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL SANCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST OFFENSE</td>
<td>A minimum of Disciplinary Probation for 1 full semester</td>
<td>Assigned Grade of &quot;F&quot; in the course</td>
<td>Educational program as determined by the panel / conduct officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND OFFENSE (related to academic dishonesty or serious first offense)</td>
<td>A minimum of Disciplinary Suspension for 4 full semesters</td>
<td>Assigned Grade of &quot;F&quot; in the course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As the new semester begins, we encourage you to be active in fostering academic integrity and community standards. A culture of integrity is essential on our campus to promote intellectual honesty and respect for intellectual property. We strive to provide an environment that encourages the ethical pursuit of knowledge and understanding. This is one part of a broader expectation of respect for all members of our community.

As a community of learners, we know that humans make errors in judgment at times. Sometimes these errors in judgment involve academic dishonesty. Sometimes they involve actions that violate the community of trust and respect that we expect our classrooms to foster. We want to foster an educational climate that helps prevent actions that violate our expectations of respect, integrity and understanding.

This year faculty are being asked to engage students in discussions to assist their understanding of the distinctions between appropriate and inappropriate actions. To aid in these discussions, they may consider the use of one or more vignettes made available to them through CourseSite. Greg Reihman, Director of Faculty Development, developed seven short vignettes describing cases where student actions bring into question issues of academic integrity and community standards. These vignettes are available at http://www.lehigh.edu/lts/official/Academic_Integrity_Vignettes.pdf. The five
vignettes on academic dishonesty cases are all based on actual cases that have come before the University Committee on Discipline.

Additional resources on academic integrity for students and faculty are available here. Included are sample syllabus statements for different course types that faculty can consider including in their course syllabi to outline their expectations and policies. You'll also find information about turnitin.com’s plagiarism detection service for both faculty and students. The web resources also provide an understanding of the student Code of Conduct's expectations, ways to report violations of the Code, and the thoughtful adjudication of Code violations to which the Dean of Students Office is committed.

The Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates have affirmed students’ responsibility to uphold academic integrity by creating student statements of academic integrity (http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/conduct/aireporting.shtml). During orientation, first-year students sign a pledge to abide by the Undergraduate Student Senate's affirmation of the Code of Conduct. At the first-year convocation, a representative of the Student Senate presents a binder containing those signatures to the President. This symbolic ritual highlights the core values of honesty and integrity in Lehigh's culture. The Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates have also affirmed Lehigh’s Principles of Our Equitable Community.

We thank you in advance for partnering to demonstrate that Lehigh University is a community of academic integrity and respect for others.
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INFORMED CONSENTS

Request for Informed Consent (First survey)

I agree to participate in a doctoral research investigation of faculty responses to academic dishonesty conducted by Sharon K. Basso, Dean of Students at Lehigh University, and a doctoral degree candidate at the University of Delaware. This research investigation is under the direction of Dr. Barbara Curry, Associate Professor, in the School of Education at the University of Delaware.

I understand that the focus of this investigation is the array of encounters of Lehigh University faculty with instances of cheating, the nature of the faculty members’ responses to cheating, the varying dimensions of those experiences, and the processes faculty members use as they make decisions about how to respond to student cheating.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to (a) gather critical incidents of academic dishonesty from faculty members, experiences, and to (b) analyze faculty members’ hypothetical responses to representative situations. I understand that I am one of sixty participants randomly selected (fifteen from each of the four college faculties at Lehigh University). This investigation employs Flannagan’s critical incident technique in which respondents are asked to describe actual incidents of academic dishonesty in which they have been involved.

I understand that the enclosed questionnaire asks me to describe academic dishonesty situations at Lehigh University of which I have been aware and that the questionnaire may take me 10 minutes to complete. I understand that my responses will at no time contain my name and the questionnaire will not be coded in any way. Two demographic items, gender and academic rank, are included in the questionnaire. The results of the study will be reported in the aggregate, not individually. I understand that all data will be stored in “double-locked” files and will be destroyed six years following publication of the study. Only the investigator will have access to the secured data. I understand that if I withdraw from the study my data will be destroyed immediately. I understand that the risks to me are minimal but may include discomfort from recalling potentially disturbing incidents of academic dishonesty. Further, I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me for participating, but
that the findings from this research may improve understanding of faculty responses to academic dishonesty at Lehigh University.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that I may elect not to respond to any question with no penalty or loss. I further understand that if I have any questions about this study I may contact the investigator, Sharon K. Basso, by phone at (610) 758-4156 or via mail at University Center Room 108. When the investigator’s degree is completed, the results of this research will be available by obtaining a copy of the published dissertation titled, “Academic Dishonesty at Lehigh University: Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions Inform Institutional Policy”.

As this is a jointly approved investigation at both Lehigh University and The University of Delaware, where the investigator is a doctoral student, I may report any problems that result from my participation in this study to Ruth L. Tallman, Office of Research, and Sponsored Programs, Lehigh University, (610)-758-3024, and/or Dr. T. W. Fraser Russell, Vice Provost for Research, 210 Hullihen Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-1551, phone (302) 831-2136.

As with any survey research, this study is dependent on a high rate of return, and I understand that my participation is valued and appreciated. By initialing each page and signing below, I agree to participate in this study.

_________________________
Date Participant’s Signature

Return one signed/initialized copy of this informed consent letter in the enclosed envelope and retain a copy for your records. Also, return your completed questionnaire in a separate enclosed envelope. Please do not return the informed consent letter and the questionnaire in the same envelope.
Request for Informed Consent (Second survey)

I agree to participate in a doctoral research investigation of faculty responses to academic dishonesty conducted by Sharon K. Basso, Dean of Students at Lehigh University, and a doctoral degree candidate at the University of Delaware. This research investigation is under the direction of Dr. Barbara Curry, Associate Professor, in the School of Education at the University of Delaware.

I understand that the focus of this investigation is the array of encounters of Lehigh University faculty with instances of cheating, the nature of the faculty members’ responses to cheating, the varying dimensions of those experiences, and the processes faculty members use as they make decisions about how to respond to student cheating.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to (a) gather critical incidents of academic dishonesty from faculty members, experiences, and to (b) analyze faculty members’ hypothetical responses to representative situations. I understand that I am one of three hundred participants randomly selected from Lehigh University faculty members. This investigation employs a paired comparison questionnaire and a bipolar rating scale questionnaire.

I understand that the enclosed questionnaire asks me to rate pairs of cheating incidents indicating their similarity to one another. In addition, I will be asked to rate nine cheating incidents on a set of six bipolar rating scales. The questionnaire may take me 20 minutes to complete. I understand that my responses will at no time contain my name and the questionnaire will not be coded in any way. Two demographic items, gender and academic rank, are included in the questionnaire. The results of the study will be reported in the aggregate, not individually. I understand that all data will be stored in “double-locked” files and will be destroyed six years following publication of the study. Only the investigator will have access to the secured data. I understand that if I withdraw from the study my data will be destroyed immediately. I understand that the risks to me are minimal but may include discomfort from recalling potentially disturbing incidents of academic dishonesty. Further, I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me for participating, but that the findings from this research may improve understanding of faculty responses to academic dishonesty at Lehigh University.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that I may elect not to respond to any question with no penalty or loss. I further understand that if I have any questions about this study I may contact the investigator, Sharon K. Basso, by phone at (610) 758-4156 or via mail at University Center Room 108. When the investigator’s degree is completed, the results of this research will be available by
obtaining a copy of the published dissertation titled, “Academic Dishonesty at Lehigh University: Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions Inform Institutional Policy”.

As this is a jointly approved investigation at both Lehigh University and The University of Delaware, where the investigator is a doctoral student, I may report any problems that result from my participation in this study to Ruth L. Tallman, Office of Research, and Sponsored Programs, Lehigh University, (610)-758-3024, and/or Dr. T. W. Fraser Russell, Vice Provost for Research, 210 Hullihen Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-1551, phone (302) 831-2136.

As with any survey research, this study is dependent on a high rate of return, and I understand that my participation is valued and appreciated.

________________________

Date                           Participant’s Signature

You may retain this informed consent letter for your records. There is no need to return the signed consent form to the researcher. By completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire, your consent to participate in the study is assumed. If you do not consent to participate in this study, do not complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.