Developing a Sustainable Holistic Institutional Approach: Dealing with Realities "on the Ground" When Implementing an Academic Integrity Policy

31

Erica J. Morris and Jude Carroll

Contents

Abstract

This chapter revisits the development of a holistic institutional approach for enhancing policy and practice related to academic integrity in higher education institutions. It draws on research and on the extensive practical experience of the authors to identify key issues, which may undermine the effective implementation of policy. The aims are to suggest remedies for impediments to implementation, to establish good practice, and to share lessons from institutional academic integrity initiatives. First, we review how variations in understanding of academic integrity issues among staff can impact on how consistently a policy is used. We then discuss how policy can be regularly reviewed and "kept alive" through working with staff and students, and finally, we discuss how to help stakeholders recognize that there are no "quick fixes" to addressing the issue of student academic misconduct. Institutional change requires commitment and resources from many people, especially from university senior managers, and

E.J. Morris (✉)
Anglia Learning and Teaching, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, UK
e-mail: erica.morris@anglia.ac.uk

J. Carroll
Independent Educational Development Consultant, Formerly at Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK
e-mail: jude@judecarroll.co.uk

T. Bretag (ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity*,
DOI 10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_23

connected strategies involving staff and students over a significant time period. The chapter concludes with recommendations on how shared understanding, active involvement, and long-term thinking might be achieved.

Introduction

Decisions about policy implementation usually sit within a wider set of requirements and codes. In the UK, requirements for assuring academic integrity are stated by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), an independent body that safeguards and advises on standards in higher education. For UK decision-makers, the QAA *Quality Code* provides indicators of sound practice across a range of matters impacting on quality for students. In the part of the *Code* that concerns assessment, the QAA indicator suggests:

> Higher education providers operate processes for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice. (QAA 2013, p. 23)

Readers outside the UK could seek out their relevant codes and quality assurance requirements as these often set the parameters for action and can give impetus to attempts to enhance practice. The discussion here is shaped by the authors' accumulated experience of working with educational institutions, largely but not exclusively in Anglo-Western universities, and readers based in other contexts may need to reshape or modify suggestions in the light of their own circumstances.

In most higher education contexts, a holistic approach to academic integrity has several goals, many focused on encouraging scholarly behavior in students and supporting underpinning values of honesty and integrity across the university community. However, in line with QAA requirements above, an important goal must be creating a framework of fair and transparent procedures to manage unacceptable academic practice in students. This, in turn, can also enhance students' learning by encouraging assessment *for* learning and by supporting the development of students' academic skills (Carroll 2007; Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Morris et al. 2010a). A holistic approach must also be developed with regard to institutional context, particularly in terms of a diverse student body (whether predominately studying full-time or part-time or campus-based, online, or distance learners). But a framework cannot in itself achieve these goals – those implementing it need to be engaged and well resourced. Each context will have its particular pressures and priorities, but in general, several issues seem to be especially likely to block or slow down the implementation and uptake of academic integrity policy. This chapter focuses on three clusters of issues that have implications for, and may undermine, the effective implementation of policies and procedures for supporting academic integrity and for managing academic misconduct. The issues selected are as follows:

- The varied understanding of academic integrity issues among staff expected to have a role to play in implementing policy. This varied understanding can be accompanied by differences in staff preferences and willingness to get involved in managing such issues. It can also mean variations in how staff deal with breaches of academic regulations.
- The tendency for academic integrity policy to stay "on the shelf," and the associated challenges of ensuring that policy is regularly reviewed and embedded within an institution (or faculty or department).
- The need for stakeholders to recognize that there are no straightforward solutions or "quick fixes" to address the issue of student academic misconduct. Instead, implementing a holistic approach requires resources to be committed by the university or college and significant time for institutional development and change to occur.

Engaging Staff and Developing Their Shared Understanding

Throughout the research and good practice literature on academic integrity, there has been a particular focus on students – on the varied reasons why they might plagiarize – whether they are aware of institutional policy and how their academic skills need to be acquired and honed (see, e.g., Sutherland-Smith 2008; Power 2009; Bretag et al. 2013). However, one of the significant facets of achieving a holistic approach is to focus on what staff are doing. Are teachers, administrators, and senior managers engaged with the issues? Are they aware of what the policy says they should do, and do they understand it? Most importantly, are staff willing to become involved? In relation to staff, studies document variation in how these questions are answered, and the authors' anecdotal experience confirms that diversity in understanding and willingness to engage is widespread (see, e.g., de Jager and Brown 2010; Glendinning 2013, 2014). Inconsistency is also common in how people follow procedure and in decision-making, such as deciding which penalty to apply. Studies documenting variation include Tennant and Duggan (2008), de Jager and Brown (2010), Martin and van Haeringen (2011), and Williams et al. (2012).

Of course, diversity is inevitable in any body of teaching staff, even when prior educational experience and achievement may appear similar. Teaching staff will bring their own prior conceptions as well as their attitudes and beliefs about student learning and about cheating, plagiarism, and collusion. These beliefs, in turn, are likely to affect how staff react when encountering unacceptable behavior in students. Some may not recognize the issue as an "issue," perhaps treating problems in novice academic writers as better left alone or assuming that students will somehow master academic writing skills later in their program of study. Some may think that existing policy for a minor offense is too harsh or that those for more serious offenses might not be easy to justify if challenged. Some, perhaps many, ignore a presenting issue because they are not clear of the procedure or think that it is overcomplicated or takes too much of their time (e.g., too much "form filling" or

too much investigation). These are not just minor complaints since teaching staff typically have a range of professional commitments, with challenges in managing competing priorities, pursuing their research, and leading or teaching on programs with large cohorts of students (Morris et al. 2010a, b).

Most of us who work in higher education have heard comments like those above, but there are also studies of staff perceptions, conducted over more than a decade. In 2005, McCabe in the USA found that 40 % of teachers responding to his extensive questionnaires admitted overlooking cases (McCabe 2005). In 2012, Williams and colleagues surveyed academics, again in the USA, on their perceptions of academic integrity and on how they dealt with cases and found that 18 % indicated that they had "ignored suspected incidents of cheating" (p. 16). The respondents' reasons for overlooking cheating included insufficient evidence, that the incidence was viewed as relatively minor and/or belief that students would eventually be punished for such breaches by someone else (Williams et al. 2012). A study in Canada on the same issues (Zivcakova et al. 2012) interviewed faculty who had concerns that there was a lack of consistent guidelines and lack of support for those managing particular issues of student misconduct. Their apparent discontent with policy led some "to deal with misconduct on their own" (p. 36) and justified their individualized treatment with a range of explanations: sympathies for students (e.g., they should not be failed for their poor judgment) and the significant time it could take to follow through a case. These findings echo those reported by Carroll and Appleton (2005) in the UK and Martin and van Haeringen (2011) in Australia. They all show lack of a shared understanding, coupled with inconsistent individual reactions, plus little confidence in existing policy resulting in patchy or inconsistent application of policy and procedures.

To address these types of issues, it is important to hear and empathize with staff concerns, starting with their worries about time demands and about uncertainty in following procedures. It is important to think widely about who might need education, support, and interventions. The following groups are often significant:

- **Senior staff** who need to mandate writing a policy and taking it through institutional endorsement. They typically need information about the issues, data on local circumstances, guidance on their legal responsibilities, and reminders of where practice has been successful elsewhere.
- **Professional staff** who might develop procedures and create documentation. They typically ask about how documents need to be worded, how to create standardized proformas, and record keeping requirements.
- **Academic support staff** who help students to acquire skills in information literacy and writing. Their needs often include ways to collaborate with and to feed into academic processes.
- **Quality assurance specialists** who may monitor and adjust arrangements in light of experience. As with senior managers, these specialists often need information, or referral to others' good practice. For example, in the UK the Office of the Independent Adjudicator has a significant role to play in students'

complaints about their treatment, with a significant number being complaints about managing unacceptable academic practice.

- **Teaching staff** who clearly have a role at all stages of learning and assessment, from identification of cases through referral and, in many cases, taking action on cases judged "not serious" through reducing marks and/or the award of academic credit. The next section on professional development lists actions and activities designed to address the needs of this important group.

Staff engagement in the groups mentioned above – in all these groups – is important because the actions of one group influence the choices of others. Misunderstanding by members of one or more of these groups can negatively influence decisions for the institution as a whole. For example, if senior managers misunderstand the range and frequency of breaches of academic regulations, perhaps assuming that all plagiarism is cheating, or that misconduct in year one is not important, then educational responses for minor forms of inadvertent plagiarism will be problematic. Yet, as explained elsewhere in this section, having a range of penalties calibrated to the severity of cases is vital for fair and sustainable treatment. If support staff misunderstand their importance in rethinking and changing assessment practice, then they may not challenge teachers who set assignments that make finding and faking answers more likely. If teachers are unaware of quality assurance requirements, they are unlikely to change their practices and so on. However, education and awareness raising are insufficient if interventions fail to address the issues that staff give for avoiding engagement. In particular, attention needs to be paid to concerns about overly complex processes and about demands on staff time.

Staff are demotivated to deal with a potential case of academic misconduct (even for a relatively minor form of student plagiarism) if they believe taking action will demand a significant amount of time. A positive and effective response to this has included rethinking how cases are managed and to remove the burden at an early stage from those identifying a breach. One mechanism for doing this is to appoint specialist officers for academic integrity within a university unit or department. Specialists can have a role in raising awareness of the issue of plagiarism and related forms of unacceptable practice and, in addition, can have a remit to support and "run" an academic (mis)conduct procedure. For example, there are UK universities that have introduced a system of academic conduct officers, who are academic or teaching staff with formal responsibility for investigating and managing cases (Carroll 2014; Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Morris and Carroll 2011). One of the advantages of such a system is that these officers usually work at the level of the department, so they develop an understanding of academic integrity issues in the context of cognate subjects or disciplines. Such a role might also open up opportunities to feed into policy review and to disseminate good practice on assessment design at the local (departmental) or wider institutional level as described later in this chapter. Zivcakova et al. (2012) found that staff "comfort level with academic integrity issues" (p. 30) was rated "high" by a majority, with one reason being the advice and support received from faculty-based academic integrity advisors.

Another initiative, which might have the positive benefit of improving staff engagement, is to address issues where staff are especially worried about inconsistency, with a frequent choice being variable use of so-called plagiarism "detection" tools. Text-matching tools, such as *Turnitin*, are increasingly used within universities and colleges to aid the identification of material that might have been copied from a published or previously submitted source. Such tools can also be used as part of the assignment marking process, and if a potential incidence of plagiarism or collusion is found, then the relevant aspects of the originality report can be used as supporting evidence in taking a case forward. Whether and how staff effectively use a text-matching tool is likely to be affected by their understanding of academic integrity issues, their experience of designing and marking assessments, and their knowledge of the potential and limitations of the tool. A survey by de Jager and Brown (2010) reports the standard reasons for not using *Turnitin*, that is, difficulties in using the system and concerns about it taking too much time, as well as its irrelevance in assessment tasks that are not text based. Myths or "rules of thumb" about *Turnitin* are commonplace and can lead to problematic variation in how staff use the tool and assess student work. Among staff groups, there can be informally agreed or understood percentage thresholds (indicated through originality reports), which are used as a primary indicator to look more carefully at an assignment (although a particular percentage threshold may or may not necessarily entail significant instances of copied material).

To raise awareness of the issues and to move toward consistent use, institutional policy and guidelines on employing such tools in the assessment process are therefore vital. One case study on the use of *Turnitin* at a UK university provides examples of what might be included: how policy outlined that students should be informed of its planned use and how it should be used to assess all student work for an assignment (e.g., not for particular individuals) and should be employed formatively and summatively (Graham-Matheson and Starr 2013). Interestingly, program leaders could, however, decide on other aspects of usage, such as whether students could see originality reports for their assignments and how many times a student could submit drafts for formative purposes; it was found that staff interviewees pointed to the importance of moving to more consistency in employing *Turnitin* at an institutional level by, for example, specifying whether students can see originality reports or submit a number of drafts (Graham-Matheson and Starr 2013).

Once it is agreed what the particular expectations are, then stating them helps to ensure parity and fairness in considering student work (Morris and Carroll 2011). Guidelines need to be specific in highlighting how staff might uncover potential incidences of unacceptable academic practice as part of the marking process. Guidance could also be given on how a text-matching tool might be used formatively as part of the learning process. Policy should specify the rationale for using a text-matching tool and how it should be used by staff and students (Morris and Carroll 2011). Clearly, staff development strategies are essential in ensuring that educators have opportunities to acquire good practice in the use of text-matching tools as part of the process of assessing student work, including how such tools can be used by students to improve their academic writing skills. The importance of

changing assessment practices and redesigning assessment to address academic integrity issues is considered in detail in ▶ Chap. 70, "Academic Integrity: A Teaching and Learning Approach" (Section 10 of this handbook).

A second common area for concern about inconsistency and lack of engagement with procedures is around decision-making as to the relative seriousness of an incident. One way to address this is through creating frameworks and decision-making tools, such as those developed by Yeo and Chien (2007) in one Australian university. These guidelines for deciding severity and then for allocating a penalty can be used by teaching staff to form judgements relating to a particular case. They tested the use of four criteria to define three levels of seriousness of plagiarism (equivalent to incidences that might be described as "minor," "moderate," or "major"). The criteria included: the experience of the student, the form or nature of the plagiarism, the extent of the plagiarism, and the intent of the student. What is evident here is that criteria that might be implicitly used by staff (but possibly with variation) is made explicit. The framework can serve as a guide for referral to, for example, a faculty or university panel if the case is seen as sufficiently serious. Findings from the testing of this framework indicated that participants thought the tool aided their decision-making and that pairs of academics using the tool together could be beneficial in terms of achieving consistency (Yeo and Chien 2007). This development has clearly influenced how others now manage cases, as explained later in this chapter in relation to another Australian university, Griffith which uses an adapted version in determining the seriousness of a breach of academic integrity (Griffith 2011).

In summary, thinking that everyone will be willing to engage, that everyone holds similar views, and that encouraging engagement will be straightforward are all unlikely to be beliefs that encourage effective implementation of policy. On the other hand, addressing concerns about inconsistency and about time demands by taking practical steps, such as those described above, can encourage and support moves toward a more positive outcome.

Bringing Policy to Life

Policy may be existent, but may sit on the shelf, neither used nor consistently applied within a higher education institution or departmental unit. Findings from a recent large-scale survey investigating the effectiveness of institutional academic integrity policies in European countries have indicated that although institutions had policies in place, these were not necessarily consistently used (Glendinning 2014). With regard to findings from the UK, for example, 25 % of teachers thought that "all teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism" (Glendinning 2013, 2.10). The introduction and maturing of an academic conduct officer system across an institution, such as that described in the previous section, with officers working "on the ground" at the faculty or department level and who are formally recognized through senior management, can have a positive impact on the consistent use of policy and procedures. Schemes, such as that described by Yeo

and Chien (2007), designed to support staff making criteria-based judgements to establish level of severity are also likely to have a positive impact. When both specialist officers and reporting proformas are recognized by the institution, these factors can strengthen defined responsibilities for investigating and managing cases, a commitment to ongoing professional development about academic integrity issues, and supporting and mentoring academic colleagues with regard to such issues as decision-making for the appropriate referral of a case. However, policy review is still essential to:

> Ensure that the policy provides clear and detailed procedures for reporting and managing cases of unacceptable academic practice, so that the seriousness or extent of a case can be established and managed at the appropriate level. (Morris and Carroll 2011, p. 18)

Care needs to be taken in codifying procedures so that they do not increase perception among staff that policy is too formal, not current or inaccessible.

The policy may not be "owned" and "shared" by staff, particularly if roles and responsibilities concerning academic integrity have not been determined at the institutional and/or faculty and departmental level. This is more likely where there are few opportunities for:

- Awareness campaigns and information sharing;
- Staff interaction and discussion of policy and associated practice;
- Continuing staff development sessions focusing on the use of policy and guidelines; and
- Data collection and regular review of academic misconduct cases.

Addressing these gaps implies more than a one-off event or campaign but rather a sustained and well-resourced series of initiatives to keep policy alive and current. Whatever you do needs to be repeated regularly since people change and awareness of the issue can fade. New and emerging concerns will need to be addressed, such as advances in technologies or changes in the extra-university context (Glendinning 2013). In other words, policy needs to be grasped and wrestled with so that it can be "brought to life" and connected to practice through its use by a range of users across a university or college. Best practice suggests that this cannot rest with one individual:

> Establish a cross-institutional group or committee, supported by senior management, involving representatives from all academic faculties or departments, university services … and student representation … with a remit for promoting academic integrity … and developing and reviewing the policy … and related guidance for staff and students. (Morris and Carroll 2011, p. 8)

This group can provide a central focus, working with staff and students to run campaigns, seminars, or workshops, and ensure the development of engaging innovative resources that can be provided on the institution's academic integrity website. This can mean that a variety of stakeholders are involved in the design,

introduction, and evaluation of policy and procedures, with associated training in their use. Formally recognized responsibilities are integral to the success of policy development and adoption, and these should be agreed and specified for staff (including senior managers, teaching staff, and academic integrity officers) and for students. These responsibilities should relate to key areas, such as informing and educating students, staff development, and the management of cases (Morris and Carroll 2011). Glendinning (2013) made special mention of the needs of student representatives who might be working on policy development groups and/or as members of academic integrity panels.

Policy review should draw on evidence and be informed by data. Several studies (e.g., Carroll and Appleton 2005; Martin and van Haeringen 2011; Yeo and Chien 2007) recognized that holding and maintaining data on cases is key to effective monitoring. Data is also needed to evaluate impact of introducing a policy and/or assessing the value of any changes to existing policy:

> Establish a centralized system to record and monitor cases of unacceptable academic practice, which can be readily used by those with relevant responsibilities. (Morris and Carroll 2011 p. 20)

It is clear, therefore, that just having a policy is insufficient, whereas having one and supporting it with staff development, review, and information dissemination will make change more likely. Staff development strategies might entail information, advice and guidance, and opportunities for enhancing understanding through workshops or online forums (Morris and Carroll 2011). As part of developing a holistic institutional approach, universities and colleges have used a website as a central vehicle to bring together regulations and guidance and assets, such as videos of student perspectives or case studies (e.g., City University London 2014; Griffith 2014). This is an ongoing and demanding area in which to operate.

Institutional Solutions Require Resources and Time

As is clear from the previous two sections, there is no one "magic" solution, even one based on technology, as Sutherland-Smith (2008) highlights. She describes how an institution may respond to worries about student academic misconduct by introducing a text-matching tool, with the assumption that this is likely to deter students from plagiarism and enable staff to (more easily) "detect" cases. These hopes prove unfounded. Glendinning (2013) documents the same "quick fix" mentality among her survey respondents:

> A view emerged from some responses at the senior and national levels expressing perhaps over-confidence that the adoption of digital tools together with vigilance of academic staff would be sufficient measures for responding to student plagiarism. (Glendinning 2013, p. 13)

Sutherland-Smith (2008) also describes the dangers of trying to improve process and associated policy documentation by relying on executive or senior management initiatives. The risk is that the (new) policy may not make sense to or be "owned" by departmental staff and/or by those with responsibility for identifying, investigating, and managing cases. Even apparently strong responses, such as introducing new technology, running a 1-week campaign, or making penalties "harsher," are almost always insufficient because institutional development and change to address the issue through a holistic approach takes *time*, that is, around 3–5 years for positive results in terms of staff and student understanding of academic integrity issues. It takes time to implement policy and check for better consistency, time to establish staff development forums, and time to collect and review case records and guidelines.

To support the calls for patience, resources, and complex thinking, it is now possible to point to examples where institutions have been successful and by tracking how changes have been made, to make it clear why change was possible. One case study that shows all these things is that of Martin and van Haeringen (2011) who describe a comprehensive initiative at one Australian university, Griffith, over a period of around 3 years. The aim was to enhance academic integrity policy and practice through the development of an institutional framework. The process started with gaining the commitment of a senior member of academic staff who then became a project champion, consulting staff, and commissioning studies to document staff dissatisfaction with existing policy. They could show that a significant number saw current procedures as "reactive and punitive" and as used inconsistently (Martin and van Haeringen 2011, p. 88). One early activity involved setting up a reference group and undertaking a review of the policy, good practice literature, and case studies of exemplary institutional approaches. Once they were sure what needed attention, changes were first trialed in particular academic faculties to identify improvements, and then action was taken on findings. For example, the project set up an academic integrity website for staff and students and checked whether it improved communication across the university. Once they had a framework for decision-making, the Griffith team implemented it university-wide and continued to make changes. After 3 years, they could point to a criteria-based scheme to determine the severity of cases and had specialists who were trained in its use. They then evaluated what they had done and again documented local impact and changes in perceptions among staff and students. Their conclusion:

> These … processes have allowed the University to respond to breaches of academic integrity in an equitable and timely manner, foster the continued development of a culture of integrity and reduce the administrative burden on academic staff. They benefit students by improving the quality of their learning experiences. (Martin and van Haeringen 2011, pp. 94–95)

There are valuable features of this approach: its emphasis on "prevention and educational responses" in developing the framework and the range of continuing professional development opportunities for staff. The latter also included guidelines on designing assessment. Staff consultation played a significant role, as did iterative development of policy through trialing, stakeholder feedback, and building on

evidence. These factors contributed to the effective implementation of policy across the institution, but a key outcome for success could have been the initiative leading to what the authors refer to (above) as the "development of a culture of integrity."

Institution-wide initiatives on academic integrity may, however, be hindered in achieving change throughout an institution, as inevitably faculties or departments will have different contexts and educational practices that may have an impact. Institutional initiatives may refer to promoting or fostering a culture of academic integrity, but changing policy may not significantly change practice, and consideration must be given to what is meant by "culture." At City University London in the UK, an initiative was run over a two and half-year period and involved nominating educational development associates, allocating them time for the role, and providing professional development to equip the associates to work within their own faculties as "change agents" and to enact the changes needed to make policy for academic integrity effective. It was expected that associates would work locally to adapt assessment, encourage staff engagement, and serve as nodes of expertise for their colleagues (Baughan et al. 2008; Baughan 2013, p. 90).

A qualitative study explored the associates' experiences of the process of change at the school level, in which differing conceptions relating to the initiative emerged (Baughan 2013). For example, some associates conceived the initiative primarily "through barriers to change," in which they felt that staff were not necessarily engaged with the issue of academic misconduct within a school or that other competing institutional priorities meant that implementation for change was not straightforward. An alternative conception held by other associates is related to seeing the initiative as beginning to lead to a change in culture, but they felt that "*full* culture change had not yet been achieved" (ibid., p. 96). It also became clear through the study that associates experienced particular issues in implementing change that were related to their school context. Baughan 2013 points to how it is important for initiatives to look at what is meant by "culture change" with regard to an institution-wide initiative and how there will be particular practices (and cultures) within second-level organizational structures. The latter must be explored and taken account of in designing institutional initiatives for enhancing academic policy and practice.

Institutional case studies, such as that offered by Griffith University, illustrate the degree and duration of support required to successfully change academic integrity policy and practice. It is also apparent from other key case studies (e.g., Baughan et al. 2008; Baughan 2013) that top-down "thou shalt" initiatives may not be effectively taken up at faculty, school, or department level and so must be introduced with sensitivity, local awareness, and considerable persistence.

Summary

This chapter has revisited the importance of adopting a holistic institutional approach in developing academic integrity policy and practice but has emphasized "on the ground" issues that should be addressed to ensure that such an approach is sustainable beyond the point where a policy is created and declared to be in

operation. Change usually emerges from a complex mix of activities, information gathering, and event management, and this type of approach suggests a project management focus, with interim goals and iterative review. Progress is aided by "top-down" requirements and interest and by "bottom-up" support – both are needed to prevent initiatives becoming "blocked" by unsympathetic local cultures and by the inevitable tensions of priorities and demands. Policy must be "kept alive" through regular review, which draws on staff experiences of using documentation and importantly through keeping data consistently on academic misconduct cases across a university or college. The goal is changing culture by changing how people think and act in relation to managing student misconduct. With an institution as complex as a university, with highly diverse participants, and with varied interpretations of policy and procedural issues linked to academic integrity, it cannot be assumed that all will automatically adhere to and share conceptions about being honest and about showing integrity. Values cannot be mandated but rather values develop over time as a result of an individual's own reflection and understanding of moral principles governing behavior. Policy needs to include measures that can help foster a shared acceptance of espoused values while at the same time requiring compliance with rules and regulations regardless of the values held. Looking at and discussing shared values can help in this regard, in which institutions can:

> Include statements about the importance of academic scholarship and honesty in policy and related guidance for unacceptable academic practice, where the principles and values for academic integrity and academic practice are considered. (Morris and Carroll 2011, p. 15)

Values underpin policy and procedures, but what is advocated here is an approach that recognizes that there will be differences in understanding of academic integrity issues among staff. An effective management strategy will try to discover what the differences are and to take steps to bring views into closer alignment. Understanding and take-up of policy and procedures will be enhanced by holding interactive events, such as forums or workshops, so that staff can discuss issues and review complex academic misconduct cases and/or the criteria used in determining penalties. An effective approach should not "gloss over" staff concerns about potential difficulties – they are real and worries about time demands, in particular, can "block" any hope of gaining staff engagement with dealing with cases of student academic misconduct. If implementation is to be sustainable, then those overseeing implementation need to draw upon the wide and growing examples of success which now are available, adapting what works elsewhere to the particular concerns of local teachers, support staff, quality assurance specialists, and students. The tactics chosen might vary: it might mean introducing an academic conduct officer system, redesigning a simple proforma for recording penalty decisions, enabling all staff to see the full range of learning benefits available through text-matching software, or guiding colleagues in the redesign of assessment tasks to make misconduct less likely. In truth, it is likely to involve all these activities over time, and all of these activities will probably require staff support and mentoring.

A holistic approach requires significant commitment, involvement, and support which mandates "a shared, consensual, and long-term approach" (Carroll 2014, p. 12).

References

Baughan, P. (2013). The missing meso: Variation in staff experiences of an academic practice initiative and lessons for educational change. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 9* (1), 89–100.

Baughan, P., Duncan, N., Dymiotis-Wellington, C., Halsall, S., Litosseliti, L. & Vielba, C. (2008). Promoting good academic practice through the curriculum and project work. *London Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 7th International Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 4, pp. 78–86). City University London.

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R. McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L. & James, C. (2013). Teach us how to do it properly!. An Australian academic integrity student survey. *Studies in Higher Education*, doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.777406.

Carroll, J. (2007). *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University.

Carroll, J. (2014). Revisiting the management of student plagiarism in the light of ideas outlined in 2005. *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1). http://bejlt.brookes.ac.uk. Accessed 4 July 2015.

Carroll, J., & Appleton, J. (2005). Towards consistent penalty decisions for breaches of academic regulations in one UK university. *The International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/3. Accessed 4 July 2015.

City University London (2014). StudyWell website: http://www.city.ac.uk/about/education/lead/resources/studywell. Accessed 10 Nov 2014.

de Jager, K., & Brown, C. (2010). The tangled web: Investigating academics' views of plagiarism at the University of Cape Town. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(5), 513–528.

Glendinning, I. (2013). *Impact of policies for plagiarism in higher education across Europe. Plagiarism policies in the United Kingdom. Full report*. http://ippheae.eu/project-results. Accessed 14 Nov 2014.

Glendinning, I. (2014). Responses to student plagiarism in higher education across Europe. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 10*(1), 4–20.

Graham-Matheson, L., & Starr, S. (2013). Is it cheating or learning the craft of writing? Using Turnitin to help students avoid plagiarism. *Research in Learning Technology, 21*, 17218. doi:10.3402/rlt.v21i0.17218.

Griffith University (2011). *Institutional framework for promoting academic integrity among students*. http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/Framework%20for%20Promoting%20Academic%20Integrity.pdf. Accessed 9 Nov 2014.

Griffith University (2014). Academic integrity website: http://www.griffith.edu.au/academic-integrity. Accessed 10 Nov 2014.

Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism—A complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 233–245.

Martin, J., & van Haeringen, K. (2011). Can a policy change practice? An evidence-based approach to developing policy. In *Educational integrity: Culture and values. Proceedings of the 5th Asia Pacific conference on educational integrity* (pp. 87–95). The University of Western Australia, 26–28 September 2011. http://www.apcei.catl.uwa.edu.au/procs/martin.pdf. Accessed 4 July 2015.

McCabe, D. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1) http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/issue/view/3. Accessed 4 July 2015.

Morris, E., Badge, J., Balshaw, J., Baughan, P., Carroll, J., English, J., Ireland, C., Juwah, C., Neville, C., Pickard, J., Pringle, G., Pryor, M., Seckler, J., Walker, D. & Adamson, M. (2010a). *Supporting academic integrity: Approaches and resources for higher education*. Academy JISC Academic Integrity Service, The Higher Education Academy, UK. https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/workstreams-research/themes/assessment-and-feedback/academic-integrity. Accessed 2 Nov 2014.

Morris, E., Buswell, J., Robertson, C. (2010b). *Hospitality, leisure, sport and tourism network position paper on academic integrity*. The Higher Education Academy, UK. http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/position_paper_academic_integrity.pdf. Accessed 14 Nov 2014.

Morris, E., & Carroll, J. (2011). *Policy works: Recommendations for reviewing policy to manage unacceptable academic practice in higher education*. The Academy JISC Academic Integrity Service, The Higher Education Academy, UK. http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/academic-integrity. Accessed 10 Nov 2014.

Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643–662.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2013). *UK quality code for higher education. Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality. Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning*. Gloucester: QAA. http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/B6.pdf. Accessed 14 Nov 2014.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the internet and student learning: Improving academic integrity*. New York/London: Routledge.

Tennant, P., & Duggan, F. (2008). *AMBeR project. Academic misconduct benchmarking research project. Part II. The recorded incidence of student plagiarism and the penalties applied*. JISC and the Higher Education Academy, UK. http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/resources/institutional-approaches/item/tennant-amber2. Accessed 10 Nov 2014.

Williams, S., Tanner, M., Beard, J., & Hale, G. (2012). Academic integrity on college campuses. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 8*(1), 9–24.

Yeo, S., & Chien, R. (2007). Evaluation of a process and proforma for making consistent decisions about the seriousness of plagiarism incidents. *Quality in Higher Education, 13*(2), 187–204.

Zivcakova, L., Wood, E., Baetz, M., & De Pasquale, D. (2012). How do faculty members respond to their students' discussions of academic misconduct and academic integrity? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 8*(1), 25–40.