

Executive Summary:

The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) was established in 2006 at the request of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Ron Wasserstein with the acquiescence of the Faculty Senate and with membership in the Center for Academic Integrity then located at Duke University. The AIC's first task was to conduct an Academic Integrity Survey with both Washburn faculty and students; the survey used was created by the Center for Academic Integrity so that Washburn results can be compared with national aggregate data. Not surprisingly, the results of the study found that faculty perceived academic integrity to be a greater problem on this campus than did students; this finding is in accord with national aggregate results.

Next, the AIC conducted focus groups with both students and faculty. The student focus groups were conducted in English 101 and English 300 classes in order to reach a representative cross section of the student body. Faculty groups were assembled through volunteers identified by the deans of the schools and the division chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), again aiming for a representative cross section. The focus groups were conducted by graduate students in the clinical psychology program who received training from Dave Provorse (Chair and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Psychology) and Vice President of Student Affairs, Denise Ottinger. The student groups revealed that students are unclear about the Academic Integrity Policy on campus, that there is a perception among students that rules regarding academic integrity are enforced unequally across campus, and that sanctions are not applied equally. Faculty focus groups revealed a lack of clarity about Academic Integrity Policy and doubts about administrative support of faculty who wish to sanction students found guilty of academic impropriety; this doubt about administrative support was perceived at the chair, dean, and VPAA levels.

Finally, the AIC studied all of these results, consulted their own experiences, and studied Academic Misconduct Policy at other institutions. Clearly ambiguity about Academic Integrity exists on all levels of the Washburn University community (students, faculty, and administration), and the following recommendations address those ambiguities. After two years of study and consultation, the AIC makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate and to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Academic Integrity Committee Recommendations:

- I. The university must create a positive atmosphere in which academic growth and development can flourish, and academic integrity can become a priority for **all** members of the community. Faculty, students, and administration must realize that Academic Integrity applies to all and is a crucial part of an academic environment: Administration <> Faculty <> Students

- A. Begin Fall semesters with a Roll out. An "Integrity Week"

- B. Create an Integrity web page
 - C. Create a mandatory integrity quiz or tutorial

- II. Academic Misconduct Policies (AMP) must be widely available
 - A. Create a direct Link to policy on Student and Faculty pages

- III. AMP must be widely **Understood**
 - A. Recommend senate appointment of a committee to review and update the Academic Misconduct policy and write a supplemental policy in plain English

- IV. Recommend a separate Academic Appeals Board for Academic Misconduct hearings. Train board members

- V. Recommend Formal Discussions at:
 1. New faculty orientation
 2. Faculty development workshops (faculty development has asked us to offer a symposium this spring semester)
 3. In individual class rooms
 4. New Student orientation
 5. At campus forums
 6. Faculty Workshops at school and division level with case studies
- V I. Need improved communication:
 - A. Faculty to
 1. Department chair
 2. Dean of Students (Notification Form)
 - B. Dean of Students to:
 1. Individual faculty (notify of results)
 2. Annual report in aggregate format to:
 - Faculty Senate
 - Student Senate
 - Campus Newspaper

3. Recommend a registry with names of violators of Academic Impropriety Policy in Dean of Students Office. After the adjudication process is completed, names of specific students on the list could be made available to appropriate faculty on a need to know basis.

VII Recommend the assessment of the success of the recommendations (if implemented) in five years by conducting the Academic Integrity Survey again with both students and faculty.