Editorial

Academic Integrity in 2020: Editorial Year in Review

Sarah Elaine Eaton, University of Calgary

What a tumultuous year 2020 has been. As I reflect on this year and what it has meant for academic integrity in Canada and beyond, there is no doubt that the world has changed in ways we cannot yet fully appreciate.

For me, the year began with assuming the role of Co-Editor-in-Chief for the *International Journal for Educational Integrity*. I will return to this point later.

ICAI Conference 2020

I recall being at the annual conference of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 2020a), held in Portland, OR, USA, from March 6 to 8, 2020. The conference provides an opportunity to connect with friends and colleagues from around the world. The Canadian Consortium Day, offered as a day-long workshop to the main conference, has provided Canadians with an opportunity to connect since its inception (McKenzie, 2018). I expect I am not alone when I say that it is the highlight of the conference for many Canadians.

We were delighted when Jennie Miron from Humber College was named to the Board of Directors of ICAI, joining long-standing Canadian board member, Amanda McKenzie. The conference also included moments of sadness, such as when news of the passing of Robert (Bob) Clarke was shared. Clarke was known for his work with Thomas Lancaster, including coining the term contract cheating (Clarke & Lancaster, 2006). The two of them became a dynamic duo of research and presentations on the topic, impacting scholars, practitioners and policy makers around the world. For details on Clarke's passing, see Reisz (2020).

During this year's conference, the state of California to the south, and the state of Washington to the north, both declared states of emergency due to the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) coronavirus.

I recall sitting in the Portland airport after the conference awaiting the flight home to Calgary when we learned that Oregon's Governor, Kate Brown, had declared a state of emergency hours before (Hyams et al., 2020).

_____

Initial Impact of the COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic

None of us realized that the ICAI conference in Portland would be our last opportunity to connect in person at an academic integrity event in 2020. Not long after returning home, we found ourselves going into lockdown as the federal, provincial, and municipal governments responded to the virus. Subsequent conferences, as well as provincial meetings, were either cancelled or moved online. As I write this, academic integrity organizations and networks are already in the process of planning for virtual events for 2021. None of us knows when we will be able to see one another in person again.

The pivot to remote emergency teaching and learning across schools and post-secondary institutions began in March to ensure classes could continue and students could complete their academic year. That shift brought with it increased concerns about breaches of academic integrity across the country and across the world, resulting in more attention to academic integrity as well as increased workload for those with *integrity* in their professional portfolio.

Webinars rapidly emerged as a way to engage in professional development and provide support to colleagues. The ICAI responded quickly with a worldwide webinar (see Bertram Gallant et al., 2020). Universities, colleges, and provincial academic integrity networks across Canada also developed and delivered webinars that were widely attended. Examples include webinars such as the one hosted by the Manitoba Academic Integrity Network (MAIN), featuring speakers Brenda M. Stoesz, Josh Seeland, and Lisa Vogt (2020). Another example is one offered by the Taylor Institute on Teaching and Learning at University of Calgary (see Eaton, 2020a). These are just a couple of examples of the dozens of academic integrity webinars offered from March 2020 through the rest of the year.

New online communities also emerged during this time. At the University of Calgary, a small internal community of practice for academic integrity, founded by Ellen Perreault in 2016, as a way for academic departments and other units across campus to share resources about academic integrity. Perreault invited me to take on the stewardship of the group in 2017 and I carried on with our periodic meetings on campus until the pandemic. Because it was not possible to meet in person after March 2020, I re-jigged the community of practice and migrated it to an online space. I opened up the first meeting on March 30 to colleagues at other institutions and *Integrity Hour* was born. This informal group has met regularly on Monday mornings throughout the year. Conversations are participant-driven and sharing of information, ideas, and resources happens at every meeting. We typically have between 12 and 16 participants from different institutions across a number of provinces, from British Columbia to New Brunswick, join in, creating an opportunity for academic integrity experts to connect and build their professional networks. Colleagues were curious about how to implement something similar for their own professional

communities, so I wrote a how-to guide for facilitating an online community of practice for academic integrity (Eaton, 2020c).

Virtual events, such as Integrity Hour and the various webinars, have resulted in a breakthrough of sorts for the academic integrity community in Canada. Prior to the pandemic, colleagues in Atlantic Canada had yet to become active in the academic integrity community in a regular and sustained way (see McKenzie, 2018). Connecting virtually meant developing connections with new colleagues, including some on the east coast. These relationships continued to flourish throughout the year thanks to technologies that allowed us to remain in touch.

Impact of Black Lives Matter

Police killings of Black people led to social and civil unrest, catalyzed by the killing of George Floyd on May 25 in Minneapolis, MN (Hill et al., 2020). The Black Lives Matter movement had an impact across the world. Protests were held in major cities, including in Canada, with calls to defund the police. The movement sparked conversations among academic integrity experts about systemic racism in how violations are reported and addressed. I wrote a white paper calling for action to collect demographic data about students who are reported for academic misconduct to identify how systemic racism affects particular student populations and to address that racism in our institutions (Eaton, 2020b).

The need for anti-discrimination advocacy became a focus of the Alberta Council on Academic Integrity (ACAI) during this period. It led to the Council's Statement Against Racism in Matters Relating to Academic Integrity (ACAI, 2020), calling for more equitable approaches to how alleged or actual misconduct among particular student populations is addressed. In addition, some members of the steering committee collaborated to offer a professional development workshop at the Alberta Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL) annual conference (Boisvert et al., 2020).

At a steering committee meeting held in the final quarter of the year, the ACAI steering committee unanimously agreed to establish a working group on equity, diversity, and inclusion. The working group will be led by Nazanin Teymouri and Sheryl Boisvert of Norquest College, Edmonton.

Wicked Problems Related to Academic Integrity Heightened during the Pandemic

Summer proved to be a busy time for those working in academic integrity. Many of us did not take a vacation in a traditional sense and we remained busy (and often exhausted) without the typical summer lull in our professional work. Instead, academic integrity professionals

everywhere spent their time preparing for September, as one by one, institutions announced that the fall semester would be fully or mostly online (or remote). Staying connected virtually provided many of us with the energy to keep going, knowing we were not alone and that we could help one another whether it was to share ideas or resources, or to connect on a personal level for video and phone calls to catch up, and even commiserate. The pandemic meant that we worked harder to stay connected, but the energy we put into that deepened our relationships with one another in a way that had not happened before the pandemic.

A number of wicked problems (see Churchman 1967) related to academic integrity intensified during 2020: unethical file-sharing, contract cheating, and remote invigilation (i.e., e-proctoring). Prior to the pandemic, I'd never heard of e-proctoring or remote proctoring, as it is also called. I am sure I am not alone with that experience. However, e-proctoring became a major point of debate as many institutions quickly signed up for multi-year contracts with companies offering services that would lockdown students' browsers and monitor via video during exams written at home. Educators and students began to protest the use of surveillance technology in educational settings. Students all over the world initiated online petitions against the technology, including in Canada (e.g., the one initiated by students at Concordia University (Change.org, 2020). The topic received local, national, and international media attention (CBC News, 2020; Krugel, 2020; Sonnemaker, 2020; Wong, 2020). Academic integrity advocates became activists when one company sued Ian Linkletter, an employee at the University of British Columbia in September for allegedly disseminating the company's copyrighted, confidential, and proprietary information (Alden & Ha, 2020; Sonnemaker, 2020).

Companies offering contract cheating and file-sharing services have flourished this year, including those offering "24/7 homework help" (Isai, 2020). Some companies offering promises of removing unauthorized material from their sites has resulted in extensive additional work for academic integrity professionals, as the requirements to have materials removed often involves following an exacting process that requires time and effort.

The URL blocking project undertaken by colleagues in Manitoba garnered international attention when they wrote about their work on the ICAI blog (Seeland et al., 2020). Experts worked with members of their institutional administration and IT departments to implement the blocking of nearly 1,000 contract cheating and file-sharing sites on campus networks. Even though campuses were closed through much of the summer, they have not only set themselves up for success for when campuses re-open, but they have set a precedent for how collaborative action with people working together across multiple institutions can make a stronger impact.

Passing of Tracey Bretag

On October 7, 2020, Tracey Bretag passed away after a valiant battle against cancer. As I reflect on 2020 and also on the influence that Bretag had on so many of us, I recall when she came to the University of Calgary in 2019 to give the keynote address for the Canadian Symposium on Academic Integrity. One morning before the conference activities for the day began, she met the editorial board members for *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity* for breakfast to offer advice and wisdom on how to make the journal a success. She felt unwell during the symposium, but none of us, not even her, knew the seriousness of her illness when she visited us. It turned out that her visit to Calgary was one of the last international trips she would take. By the end of 2019, she knew she was terminally ill, though she kept the news private for some time.

After her passing, tributes to Bretag came in various forms, including the dedication of the International Day of Action Against Contract Cheating on October 21 to Bretag, as contract cheating was a topic that she was passionate about.

International Day of Action Against Contract Cheating

The International Day of Action Against Contract Cheating was held on October 21 this year. Jennie Miron chaired the organizing group (ICAI, 2020b), leading a global planning team to conceptualize and implement "Twenty Live in 20 -- Global Conversations about Contract Cheating Schedule" (ICAI, 2020d). The live event, offered entirely online through YouTube and Zoom, featured 20 hours of programming, offered in 1-hour segments, with contributions from around the world. The Canadian hour was titled, "Unapologetically Ethical: Canada's Stance against Contract Cheating". The panel, led by Jennie Miron, included Susan Bens (University of Saskatchewan), Sheryl Boisvert (Norquest College), Tod Denham (Thompson Rivers University), Bob Mann (Dalhousie University), Amanda McKenzie (Waterloo University), Paul Sopcak, (MacEwan University), Alycia Stewart (MacEwan University), Brenda M. Stoesz (University of Manitoba), Martin Weilemaker (University of New Brunswick), and me.

Figure 1. *Screenshot of Tweet posted by the Manitoba Academic Integrity Network showing some of the panelists for "Unapologetically Ethical: Canada's Stance against Contract Cheating."*

A video created by students at Ryerson University was especially memorable. The video, "Imagine a World Where Grades are For Sale" (Ryerson University, 2020), featured students talking about the importance of doing one's own work. The video had impact because it was created by students and hearing them talk about the importance of acting with integrity resonated with viewers. To further support students, the Academic Integrity Council of Ontario (AICO) released a new resource for the Day of Action entitled "Contract Cheating Student Tip Sheet" (Miron & McKenzie, 2020).

Concluding Reflections

As 2020 draws to a close, we are beginning to recognize the magnitude of the impact the COVID-19 virus has had on education generally, as well as on academic integrity specifically, not to mention society at large. We are still living in the midst of the pandemic and I expect that the full impact of the pandemic will not be fully understood for some time.

I mentioned in my introductory remarks, that in January 2020, I accepted the role of Co-Editor-in-Chief for the *International Journal for Educational Integrity (IJEI)*, working alongside Bretag, the co-founder of that journal. When she invited me to serve in the role, she disclosed her illness to me and made it clear that working alongside her as co-editor included a commitment to carry on as Editor-in-Chief of *IJEI* after her passing. As I take on that responsibility, it necessitates stepping down from my role as Co-Editor-in-Chief for *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity (CPAI)*. Although CPAI is still in its first few years of development, it has a strong editorial board and Brandy Usick will continue to serve as its Co-Editor-in-Chief. She will be joined by Brenda M. Stoesz, who has served as a member of the editorial board since its beginning, and is the incoming Co-Editor-in-Chief, starting in January 2021, for volume four. I look forward to continuing to support the journal as a member of the editorial board going forward.

If 2020 has taught us anything, it is that integrity matters, whether it is in our classrooms (virtual or otherwise), in our interactions, and throughout society. Although leaving the editorial role for CPAI is bittersweet, I am excited to see where Usick and Stoesz take the journal into its next chapter of development. And so, as this year draws to a close, we look to the future for change and hope.

References

Alberta Council on Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020). Statement Against Racism in Matters Relating to Academic Integrity Retrieved from https://albertaacademicintegrity.files.wordpress.com/2020/06/alberta-council-on-academic-integrity-statement-against-racism-2020-06-04.pdf

Alden, C., & Ha, A. (2020, September 3). Proctorio sues UBC staff member for tweets sharing 'confidential' information about the software. *The Ubyssey*. Retrieved from https://www.ubyssey.ca/news/proctorio-sues-linkletter/

Bertram Gallant, T., McKenzie, A., & Harrison, D. (2020, March 20). Going remote with integrity. *International Center for Academic Integrity*. Retrieved from

https://web.archive.org/web/20200805101230/https://www.academicintegrity.org/we
binar/going-remote-with-integrity/

Boisvert, S., Teymouri, N., Medicine Crane, J. A., & Eaton, S. E. (2020). *Exploring Racism and Academic Integrity through a Circle Process*. Paper presented at the Alberta Teachers' of English as a Second Language (ATESL) Annual Conference, Online. http://hdl.handle.net/1880/112689

CBC News. (2020, September 22). University of Regina students worried anti-cheating software will invade privacy. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/university-regina-students-proctortrack-privacy-concerns-1.5734005

Change.Org. (2020). Stop Concordia University from using proctored webcam exams. Retrieved from https://www.change.org/p/concordia-university-stop-concordia-from-using-proctored-webcam-exams

Churchman, C. W. (1967). Wicked Problems. *Management Science, 14*(4), B-141-B-142.

Clarke, R., & Lancaster, T. (2006). *Eliminating the successor to plagiarism: Identifying the usage of contract cheating sites*. Paper presented at the Second International Plagiarism Conference, The Sage Gateshead, Tyne & Wear, United Kingdom.

Eaton, S. E. (2020a). *Academic Integrity in Online Courses: Adapting During COVID-19*. Paper presented at the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning. https://youtu.be/pjoHHMAaQ-w

Eaton, S. E. (2020b). *Integrity Hour: A Guide to Developing and Facilitating an Online Community of Practice for Academic Integrity*. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1880/112347

Eaton, S. E. (2020c). *Race-Based Data in Student Conduct: A Call to Action*. Retrieved from Calgary, Canada: http://hdl.handle.net/1880/112157

Hill, E., Tiefenthäler, A., Triebert, C., Jordan, D., Willis, H., & Stein, R. (2020). How George Floyd Was Killed in Police Custody. *New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/31/us/george-floyd-investigation.html

Hyams, B., Orr, D., & Manning, R. (2020, March 8). Oregon Lawmakers Approve $5 Million For Coronavirus Response. *OPB*. https://www.opb.org/news/article/oregon-coronavirus-ohsu-

patient-tests-positive-covid-19-updates/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020a). 2020 Annual Conference.
        https://web.archive.org/web/20201104221546/https://www.academicintegrity.org/202
        0-annual-conference-icai/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020b). Planning Committee for
        International Day of Action Against Contract Cheating. Retrieved from
        https://web.archive.org/web/20201105141610/https://www.academicintegrity.org/ido
        a-committee/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020c). Take Action Against Contract
        Cheating, Oct. 21. Retrieved from
        https://web.archive.org/web/20201101033858/https://www.academicintegrity.org/day-
        against-contract-cheating/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020d). Twenty Live in 20 -- Global
        Conversations about Contract Cheating Schedule. Retrieved from
        https://www.academicintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20-in-20-Final-
        Schedule.pdf

Isai, V. (2020, September 28). The COVID-19 pandemic is changing how students cheat – and get
        caught. *National Observer*. Retrieved from
        https://www.nationalobserver.com/2020/09/28/news/covid-19-pandemic-changing-
        how-students-cheat-and-get-caught

Krugel, L. (2020, October 11). 'Creeped out:' Schools turn to technology in pandemic to catch
        online cheaters. *CTV News*. Retrieved from
        https://www.ctvnews.ca/health/coronavirus/creeped-out-schools-turn-to-technology-
        in-pandemic-to-catch-online-cheaters-1.5141633

McKenzie, A. M. (2018). Academic integrity across the Canadian landscape. *Canadian Perspectives
        on Academic Integrity, 1*(2), 40-45. doi:https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v1i2.54599.g42964

Miron, J. B., & McKenzie, A. (2020). Avoiding Contract Cheating Student Tip Sheet. Academic
        Integrity Council of Ontario. Retrieved from
        https://academicintegritycouncilofontario.files.wordpress.com/2020/10/student-tip-
        sheet-avoiding-contract-cheating-3.pdf

_____

Reisz, M. (2020, March 26). Robert Clarke, 1950-2020: Tributes paid to a 'contract cheating detective'. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/people/robert-clarke-1950-2020

Ryerson University. (2020, October 21). Imagine a World Where Grades are for Sale. Retrieved from https://ryecast.ryerson.ca/90/Watch/17301.aspx

Seeland, J., Stoesz, B., & Vogt, L. (2020, May 19). Shopping interrupted: Blocking access to contract cheating. Retrieved from https://www.academicintegrity.org/blog/research/shopping-interrupted-blocking-access-to-contract-cheating/

Sonnemaker, T. (2020, November 1). Tech companies promised schools an easy way to detect cheaters during the pandemic. Students responded by demanding schools stop policing them like criminals in the first place. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/proctorio-silencing-critics-fueling-student-protests-against-surveilalnce-edtech-schools-2020-10

Stoesz, B. M., Seeland, J., & Vogt, L. (2020). Promoting integrity in remote learning: Considerations for post-secondary educators. Presented at University College of the North, Manitoba, Canada. https://youtu.be/DC50it0IyV4

Wong, J. (2020, October 25). Post-secondary students call for changes to online exam rules as cheating concerns rise. *CBC News*. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/post-secondary-assessment-integrity-proctoring-1.5767953

A Reflection on Change and Academic Integrity During COVID-19

Susan L. Bens, University of Saskatchewan

I am an educational development specialist working at the University of Saskatchewan where I am the contact for academic integrity matters at the Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching and Learning. How has COVID-19 impacted my work when it comes to academic integrity? Most obvious has been the increase in the proportion of my time devoted to the topic. Whereas previously I may have spent five to ten days each year on academic integrity workshops and resources, now I am spending at least one day a week on this area (from about 2% of my time to 20%). In this short reflection, I expand on this increased activity and the nature of the change process using the five key outcomes of an individual and organizational change management model known by its acronym, *ADKAR* (Prosci, n.d.).

"A" is for Awareness of the need for change. In March 2020, across Canada, higher education shifted to remote teaching and learning to reduce the risks associated with the COVID-19 global pandemic. An immediate implication was that in-person supervised final exams could not occur as usual. Some instructors replaced the final exam with another kind of assessment, while others shifted to an open book exam to be written on a scheduled day in a 24-hour period. Instructors warned that their students would cheat on the exams. My work, and that of my colleagues, became about helping instructors to communicate with their students about academic integrity expectations and to quickly adapt their exam formats and even their assessment purposes.

"D" is for Desire to support the change. In April 2020, some instructors reported that they had detected or suspected exam cheating. Some uncovered cheating via file-sharing sites. Some reported that final exam grades were higher or of a different distribution compared to past years. Although there had been a disruption to so many teaching and learning variables during the so called "pivot", many blamed the unsupervised and 24-hour nature of the exams as the cause of the academic misconduct. Many academic leaders said they would not require or recommend a 24-hour window again and asked for online invigilation services to be made available at the institutional level. While existing distributed programs and distance courses carried on with preset invigilation practices, only one program subscribed to a service and this was as an accreditation requirement. When the costs of online invigilation were determined to be too great and the questions of privacy and effectiveness too numerous, a desire for change in the approach to assessment was established.

"K" is for Knowledge of how to change. By May 2020, many instructors had accepted the need for change that remote teaching and learning had caused. There was widespread openness toward new ideas and approaches to assessments in the remote context. For some, the desire for automated grading became apparent for their large enrolment courses. For others, when tasked with developing well-designed open book exams, they realized both the challenge and opportunity of higher order application, analysis, evaluation-oriented questions. Our Centre responded with a plethora of online workshops and resources about assessment options and, where a preference for examinations remained, for making use of the exam functions in the learning management system. At each opportunity, I shared the research about the multi-faceted conditions linked to academic misconduct (Lang, 2013).

"A" is for Ability to demonstrate the skills and behaviours required for the change. In this case, the skills and behaviours are those required to implement new or adjusted assessments, clarify and teach about the rules for academic integrity, and build relationships of respect between instructors and learners. Anecdotally, we have heard instructors describe their approaches, lessons learned, and design adjustments for Winter 2021. In sessions designed for practice and feedback, we have observed participants' ability to craft higher order questions suitable for open book exams. To enable the shift to alternative assessments, additional funding was made available for student marking assistants. But this is scant evidence of the ability of instructors to enact the strategies that make academic misconduct less likely.

"R" is for Reinforcement to make the change stick. Whether evidence will suggest that new and adjusted practices reduce academic misconduct in our context remains to be seen. Without systematic collection of academic misconduct incidence data, the reinforcement will be hit and miss. At the level of the institution, a project has been initiated by the collegial governance committee with the mandate for teaching and learning (University of Saskatchewan, n.d.) I have been asked to participate as a subject matter specialist. The proposed focus is on the near, intermediate, and longer-term strategies for improved attention and action related to academic integrity and assessment. Activities like this at the governance level have the potential to reinforce the changes and, according to the ADKAR model, it is reinforcement that is often missed to the detriment of change management processes.

As I reflect on the past seven months, I note that it was the speed of change early on that led me to join a weekly participant-driven online meeting facilitated by Dr. Sarah Elaine Eaton at the University of Calgary. Through 'Integrity Hour' I have gathered useful resources and evidence-informed insights when they have been most urgently needed and established beneficial collegial relationships with respected peers. Writing this reflection for the CPAI reinforces the value of taking the time, as a professional, for "reflection-in-action" (Schön, 1983) and, as an educational developer, to share "practice wisdom" (Bamber & Stephani, 2015). Said in simple terms, these authors call professionals to conceptualize and disseminate the knowledge and thinking that occurs during and as a result of experience.

I have composed this reflection to respond to their call and done so during a time of increasing individual and collective anxiety across Canada. I am grateful that most in-person activities were moved to remote delivery at my university to allow a safer way to carry on with teaching and learning. At the same time, I recall a variably phrased and variously attributed recommendation to "never waste a good crisis." Indeed, some of the changes we have made in response to COVID-19 should and undoubtably will be retained. I hope we—those of us who care about student learning in higher education—can incorporate what we have learned during this unprecedented time to foster more academic integrity more of the time.

References

Bamber, V., & Stephani, L. (2015). Taking up the challenge of evidencing value in educational development: From theory to practice. *International Journal for Academic Development, 21*(3), 1-13.

Lang, J. M. (2013). *Cheating lessons: Learning from academic dishonesty*. Harvard University Press

Prosci. (n.d.). *ADKAR: A model for change in business, government and our community.* Prosci Research. https://www.prosci.com/adkar/adkar-model

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

University of Saskatchewan (n.d.). Teaching, learning and academic resources committee of council.
https://secretariat.usask.ca/council/committee/TLAR/index.php#Responsibilities

My Work in Academic Integrity 2020: Not All I Hoped it Would Be

Tod Denham, Thompson Rivers University Open Learning Division & BC Academic Integrity Network Coordinator

As I began to think about on my work in Academic Integrity for 2020, I realized the year started out with so much promise, but in the end didn't turn out to be all I hoped it would be.

Reflecting on 2020, I quickly found myself being drawn back to 2019, which helped me put some perspective on 2020. 2019 was the year I was baptized, so to speak, into the world of academic integrity. It began in March of 2019 when I was given the opportunity to fill in for a colleague at the International Technology, Education and Development (INTED) Conference in Valencia, Spain. I presented her research on *Engagement of Online Faculty in the Academic Integrity Process*, and my journey into the world of academic integrity began. I returned from Spain with a new passion for academic integrity and was looking for opportunities everywhere to promote it.

In April of 2019, I attended the first ever Canadian Symposium on Academic Integrity at the University of Calgary. It was here where the flame that had been ignited in Spain was fanned into a full-on fire for academic integrity. I was inspired by so many colleagues at the Symposium, that without even having approval, I tentatively volunteered Thompson Rivers University as the host for the next Canadian Symposium on Academic Integrity in 2021. Approval was granted shortly after arriving home and so my immersion in the world of academic integrity continued. In May 2019, I was honoured to attend the Academic Integrity Inter-Institutional Meeting (AIIIM) in Winnipeg, Manitoba, and it was here where I witnessed the creation of the Manitoba Academic Integrity Network (MAIN) and was allowed to be an honourary out–of-province liaison. I returned home from Manitoba determined to get something similar happening in BC.

In June of 2019, I was back in Europe, in Vilnius, Lithuania, this time at the European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI) Annual Conference. I co-presented with my colleague who had done the research on *Engagement of Online Faculty in the Academic Integrity Process*. We had been invited to do so because someone from ENAI had attended my presentation in Spain. I returned home from this conference with an even greater passion for academic integrity. In October 2019, I helped TRU host the first ever BC Academic Integrity Day (BCAID) and it was at this day that the BC Academic Integrity Network (BCAIN) was born and I volunteered to be the coordinator. October 2019 also saw TRU participating for the first time in the International Day Against Contract Cheating, which turned out to be a very exciting and inspirational day. 2019 as a whole

was an amazing personal journey for me into the world of academic integrity, and the year ended with such high hopes for 2020.

My work in academic integrity started slowly in 2020, but I was extremely excited about all I was hoping to accomplish this year. I had big intentions for moving things forward with the BC Academic Integrity Network and of course intended to use the year to really promote and plan the Canadian Symposium for Academic Integrity that TRU would be hosting in June 2021. In February 2020, I ended up doing an impromptu webinar on *Academic Integrity in Online Exams*. It had started out with the intention of being a small online conversation that was to take place between myself and colleagues at the University of Calgary, but quickly morphed into a full-on webinar. The excitement from this was a good sign, or so I thought, for 2020 and my work in academic integrity. 2020 continued with me attending the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) annual conference in Portland in early March, and it was there that I was again inspired by many colleagues, and I left the conference so encouraged - but that was all about to change.

The onset of the first wave of the COVID-19 worldwide pandemic hit with a vengeance shortly after I arrived home, and all of a sudden, my work in academic integrity took a back seat. I found myself overwhelmed with my job and in being honest with myself, I now realize that COVID-19 had dampened the academic integrity fire that once burned so bright. I continued and continue to play an active role in the Canadian academic integrity community and I do still have a passion for it, but when reflecting back over 2020, it simply did not turn out to be the year I had hoped for as far as my work in academic integrity is concerned.

2020 still had some highlights in academic integrity for me, such as the webinar in February and the conference in March that I mentioned above. The weekly online coast-to-coast *Integrity Hour* that I attend without fail is certainly a highlight for me. I was also privileged to be a panelist in Canada's contribution to the Twenty in 20 live event that took place as part of the ICAI International Day Against Contract Cheating.

These highlights of 2020 have helped me realize that my desire to be a positive force for academic integrity is still alive and well, and as 2020 approaches its end, I am filled with hope that 2021 will be a much better year for my work in academic integrity.

Reflections on Academic Integrity and Educational Development During COVID-19

Ann Gagné, University of Toronto-Mississauga

The pivot to remote teaching and learning in mid-March came with an influx of instructors reaching out to me about various components of teaching and learning online. Some faculty members had no idea that I existed before the pandemic, and the majority certainly did not know the scope of my role. Some had discussed pedagogical aspects such as clarity of instructions and alignment of rubrics to assessments with me before the pandemic, but there were few academic integrity discussions unless the course was a blended or hybrid course.

The switch to remote learning happened around final exam time and the number one question that instructors now had was, "how do I ensure academic integrity of my exam?" The answer to this question and the pedagogical pieces aligned to that question became my priority in mid-March and all of April. My area of expertise and support is Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (CAST, 2018), accessibility, and inclusion. Therefore, I used UDL as a framework for a conversation about academic integrity and pedagogical design.

I emphasized the use of choice in assessments to support academic integrity but also to support inclusion at a time where everything is very much in flux. In some instances, this use of choice was implemented through the learning management system (in our case a Canvas platform) to support shuffling the delivery of questions or the presentation of answer options. There were also many discussions about the tension between an academic integrity framework and an inclusive learning environment in regards to questions having a time limit or the use of the no-backtracking feature in the learning management system. Ultimately, what the instructors chose for their particular exams was very much about how inclusive and accessible pedagogy or academic integrity fit in their own teaching philosophies.

The one area that created the most discussion (and still does many months later) is around the need to move assessment pieces from lower-level Bloom's taxonomy (Armstrong, 2020) type questions that are simply recall questions and can be easily searchable online, to higher-order questions involving application or evaluation of concepts. Many courses were tethered to high stakes recall question type exams and instructors commented that there was simply not enough time or grading hours to modify questions because it was easier to automate low-level recall questions. Thus, for those courses, the use of e-proctoring technology was seen by instructors as

a default way to support academic integrity (though that has not been proven), even if it certainly did not support inclusive pedagogy. Jesse Stommel (@Jessifer) and Audrey Watters (@audreywatters) have written numerous Twitter threads during the pandemic reinforcing that the proliferation of e-proctoring is a direct result of institutional finances prioritizing technology over pedagogy and grading hours for courses.

Another area that created discussion in the early days of the remote transition was around multimodal choice in assessments to support academic integrity, specifically a move from purely textual assessments to audio, video, or oral assignments. Similar to the comments about not enough teaching assistant time or funding to grade such assignments, many instructors were concerned about how to grade assignments in different modalities. Discussions around group assessments and rubric creation and alignment for the most part helped bridge these gaps and doubts.

I continue to have conversations with faculty about how academic integrity and inclusive accessible pedagogy can be concepts that work together and are not necessarily at odds. If there are positives to the pivot to remote learning, it is that instructors are now aware of both Universal Design for Learning guidelines and that educational developers exist on campuses and are there to support them with academic integrity and pedagogical design at this difficult time.

References

Armstrong, P. (2020). *Bloom's Taxonomy*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching.
        https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy

CAST. (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines. http://udlguidelines.cast.org

Academic Integrity and Student Support During COVID-19

Loie Gervais, University of Manitoba

Like my friends and colleagues across the country, in March, I scrambled to figure out how to transition my work to a remote environment when COVID-19 hit, and the University of Manitoba physically shut down. I anticipated that this shift would pose challenges, but like many, I didn't fully grasp the duration, creativity, time, or energy that would be required as the university community grappled with navigating academic integrity during a global health crisis.

To my surprise, some aspects of my work seemed to benefit from the shift online. Because working, living, and studying remotely was new for all of us, I found that participants were engaging more meaningfully in a workshop over Zoom than I would typically see in-person. Attendance was up, often due to greater accessibility, and a renewed interest in academic integrity and engagement was high, with many people asking questions they may have been hesitant to bring up in a traditional classroom setting. At one point, I asked a group of students how many were joining us from outside Winnipeg, and the overwhelming majority were in completely different time zones.

On the other hand, another aspect of my work - meeting with students (within the disciplinary process) to identify educational programming that will help them build the skills to be successful and avoid a repeat allegation – posed a significantly bigger challenge. In my experience coordinating this programming over the past few years, students usually presented to their meetings with trepidation. Often, they were angry, embarrassed, or anxious. They were almost always hesitant to talk about what happened and explore what lead to the misconduct, for fear of judgement or further incriminating themselves.

Meeting in-person with a student to discuss academic integrity allows them to physically enter a space that is entirely separate from the discipline process. In this space, I aim to facilitate an interaction that helps students to understand that academic integrity is an ongoing learning process, and to focus on the skills and knowledge they can build, rather than the misconduct that occurred. Over the course of these in-person meetings, more often than not, even hostile or resistant students would open up and reflect on the importance of academic integrity and how they could approach their studies moving forward. However, the sensitive nature of these meetings requires building a relationship of trust, which I've found to be particularly challenging over email, phone, or video chat.

Moving into our ninth month of working from home, I've become more comfortable with online brainstorming sessions, presentations, and my cats strutting in front of the camera in the middle of a meeting, but I haven't yet narrowed in on the most effective ways of remotely helping students to work through the emotional aftermath of the discipline process. While a discussion of personal difficulties often emerges naturally during these meetings, most students are still reluctant to talk about their challenges related to academic integrity. The fact that students are often more willing to talk about their financial difficulties or mental health struggles than the accidental plagiarism that occurred in their essays is indicative of the barriers that still exist when it comes to our work in this field.

Now that traditional in-person approaches are not an option, and we've found creative ways to talk about academic integrity in a variety of settings, I'm encouraged and motivated to explore the ways that we can meaningfully support students through difficult circumstances, such as recovering from an academic misconduct allegation. I tell my students that academic integrity is an ongoing learning process, and that the "right" answer is not always clear. I think this is a message that those of us in post-secondary education can also take to heart during these trying times. The year 2020 has pushed us to adapt quickly and think beyond what we have imagined was possible. Even though there are questions for which we still don't have the answer, I believe the skills and practices we have developed throughout the COVID-19 pandemic will continue to serve us in our academic integrity work long after we make the return back to campus.

Reflections on COVID-19 and Academic Integrity

Cheryl A. Kier, Athabasca University

"You don't have to change anything because you're already online!" squealed my stepmother. My colleagues at non-digital institutions expressed similar sentiments. They were right on the one hand; we did not have to transition from face-to-face lectures, but could not have been more wrong on the other hand. Yes, our course materials are online and yes, many of our exams are taken on computers, but the vast majority of these exams have always been invigilated in person. Our online exams are similar in content and structure to paper exams given by instructors at brick-and-mortar institutions, so when the invigilation centres shut down, faculty were faced with hundreds of students at once needing alternatives to invigilated exams. Using e-proctoring software, creating take-home exams or oral exams, and skipping the final exam entirely were some of the suggestions.

One of the reasons for invigilated exams at my institution is that it is the only assessment in which learners are required to show government identification to ensure that the person doing the work is the person who registered in the course. All other assessments are uploaded to the learning management system, with few checks for originality. This means that it is difficult to determine if assignments are written by the learner's friends, parents, or via paid contract cheating. Invigilated final exams make it much more likely that learners are doing their own work. Furthermore, final exams in psychology (my field) examine students' understanding of the breadth of a course and are weighted heavily to reflect this.

When the pandemic hit, the Administration told us that the preferred alternative was to use e-proctoring software to invigilate students taking their exams at home using their home computers. The University had been offering e-proctoring on a voluntary basis for a few years, so many students accepted this alternative. However, many issues precluded other students from using this remote invigilation service. Some learners did not have cameras on their computers, or their cameras were not working. At least one student living abroad did not have access to e-proctoring software due to government restrictions. Other students who used to take their exams at one of the free university invigilation centres (now closed), could not afford the fee for e-proctoring. Some could not find a quiet space in which to take the exam because their family members were working from home, and/or because they had to take care of young children who would walk into the testing room. Internet connection was not stable in some areas in which our learners lived, and some did not pay for Internet for the device that would be compatible with e-proctoring software. (For example, tablets are not compatible with the e-proctoring software

used.) After a short while, dates for e-proctoring got booked up, and students could not get appointments before their contract deadlines approached.

Having discussed the barriers, I must say that some learners went to extraordinary lengths to complete their courses using e-proctoring software. Anecdotal evidence revealed that some scheduled their exams in the middle of the night, after their children went to bed and the house was quiet. Others had their spouses take the children away for the weekend so they could concentrate on studying and taking the exam.

When learners were unable to take exams via e-proctoring, requests started coming in for them to be able to skip the final exam and just use their course marks. Their rationale for this was that some of their other instructors were allowing this. However, the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfers and the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfers approve most of my courses for transfer credit. This means my courses had been pre-approved as being equivalent to the same courses taken at other institutions in these provinces. I could not guarantee that letting some students skip the final exam would allow the courses to continue receiving transfer credit, or that individual students would receive transfer credit.

Take-home exams were another common request. Academic integrity issues with this included the fact that students could easily send the exam(s) to one another, with little to prevent this activity. Unlike some brick-and-mortar institutions, Athabasca University did not have a Spring or Summer break in which to launch changes. New assessments had to be created almost instantly. How many different versions of a take-home exam did I need to create for each course? Because of continuous enrolment (learners can start a course on the first day of any month), I had already created three to four versions of the final exam plus four to five quizzes for each of my courses. In addition, with so many questions, answers, and assignments from my courses being posted onto websites providing "study resources", it was difficult to generate new questions. Furthermore, I had already created questions for a test bank for a Canadian version of a textbook I had co-authored. My ideas for original questions were exhausted! Furthermore, how would I know if the new take-home exams were equivalent in difficulty to the invigilated exams that I had been giving students for years? Were students being treated equitably if some took invigilated exams while others took take-home ones? Thanks to help from a colleague, I learned how to use security features for PDFs to help prevent test takers from copying the questions. At first, I also added watermarks with the student's name to minimize their motivation to put the exam online. However, after a while I found the volume of students made this too difficult to do each time.

One suggestion for preventing academic misconduct in take-home exams was to put a time limit on them. One of our professional staff agreed to monitor learners by proxy. I requested data on the average length of time students took to complete my invigilated exams and used that to guide how much time the staff member should allow students to have access to their exam. Once that

time was up, the staff member removed the exam. The hope was that the time limit would prevent students from looking up answers and from downloading the exam onto their computer to be able to send it to other students or upload it online. I do not know whether that was successful.

Because there are hundreds of students who take many of my courses each year, I have 12 tutors who mark course assignments and exams. I had to contact each of them to find out what they were willing and able to do. Would the take-home exams take longer to mark? If so, and assuming they were paid for their time, did they have the time to do the extra work? If some learners took oral exams, did the tutors have the time to give those and mark them? Did the institution have the money to cover these extra costs? I had no rubric for oral exams; would tutors mark them reliably? I had no evidence to substantiate whether oral exams were equivalent in difficulty and breadth to the invigilated final exams. Would it be inequitable if some students took oral exams and others took written ones?

In sum, although I work at an institution that uses online course delivery, the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic created many sudden challenges related to academic integrity. Protecting the security of exams while upholding academic rigour was a challenge. I will not recall this period of time fondly. Instead, I look forward to when I can focus on helping students learn, and creating interesting and educational course materials. More time for research would be nice, too. Wear a mask, everyone!

COVID-19: A Silver Lining for Academic Integrity from a Pandemic

Amanda McKenzie, University of Waterloo

Never in our lifetime did any of us expect to experience a pandemic. Almost everything we once took as routine was suddenly no more (e.g., visiting family and friends, working or going to school outside of our homes, travelling within our own country and abroad to other countries etc.). Although there are many devastating impacts from COVID-19, I would like to focus on the bright spots – what we are doing well in the field and how we can leverage it (Heath & Heath, 2010).

Academic integrity issues became top news in March 2020 as instructors and students struggled with the massive and rapid shift to online education. Compounding stressors from the pandemic have exasperated some areas in teaching and learning – specifically student engagement and assessments.

Research has shown that when students feel there is value in what they are learning, they feel connected with the content and instructor, and the assessment methods are up-to-date and relevant, the incidence of academic misconduct is reduced (Bretag et al., 2018; Brimble, 2016; Morris, 2018; Young et al., 2018).

Instructors have demonstrated ingenuity in developing new ways to involve students from being passive recipients of information on the other end of a video screen to actively engaging students' interest by adding personal touches to course delivery, making themselves more approachable and humanistic, providing touch points with students across the term to check in, and providing multiple opportunities for formative feedback.

Moreover, the pandemic has necessitated revamping traditional methods of assessment such as tests, exams, and assignments that have been reused year-after-year, or evaluations that focus only on rote memorization. Instructors have implemented better ways to assess students by using summative assignments, oral examinations, peer demonstration and grading, and giving tests that build on previous knowledge in the course or using reflections and synthesis questions which cannot be easily answered using the internet.

All of the aforementioned examples of innovative instruction and assessment are bright spots (Heath & Heath, 2010) that focus on continuous improvement. Education is a shared

responsibility on both the instructor and the student to show a committed investment in teaching and learning and an aspiration to do the best they can.

Now is the time for the field of academic integrity to showcase its importance as a foundation of education. No longer should academic integrity only be a conversation during a scandal – it should be commonplace. This means that a shared understanding of academic integrity should be readily identifiable and promoted throughout all levels of educational institutions, and that frequent conversations about academic expectations and educational resources occur between instructors and students. The values of integrity need to be systemic and threaded throughout everything we do in education (Morris, 2018; Stephens, 2016).

Ultimately, building a culture of academic integrity is the best way to discourage academic misconduct (Khan, et al., 2020; Peters, 2019). Now is the time for educational institutions to seize the moment and leverage all the positive things that we have learned and demonstrated throughout the pandemic, and nurture environments that demonstrate the values of academic integrity every day going forward.

References

Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S. & van Haeringen, K. (2018): Contract cheating: a survey of Australian university students, *Studies in Higher Education*, 44:11, 1837-1856. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1462788

Brimble, M. (2016). Why Students Cheat: An Exploration of the Motivators of Student Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 365–382). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_58

Heath, C. & Heath, D. (2010). *Switch: How to change things when change is hard*. Broadway Books.

Khan, Z.R., Hemnani, P., Raheja, S., *&* Joshy, J. (2020). Raising Awareness on Contract Cheating –Lessons Learned from Running Campus-Wide Campaigns. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 18*, 175–191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09365-2

Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: five considerations for addressing contract cheating. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *14*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0038-5

Peters, M. (2019). Academic integrity: An interview with Tracey Bretag. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 51*(8), 751–756.

Stephens, J.M. (2016). Creating Cultures of Integrity: A Multilevel Intervention Model for Promoting Academic Honesty in T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 995-1007). Springer. https//doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_13

Young, R. L., Miller, G. N. S., & Barnhardt. C.L. (2018). From Policies to Principles: The Effects of Campus Climate on Academic Integrity, a Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *16*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9297-7

International Day of Action (IDoA) Against Contract Cheating 2020—Update from the Chair of the IDoA Planning Committee

Jennie Miron, Humber College

Keywords: *academic integrity, Canada, contract cheating, COVID-19, international day of action, reflection*

The year 2020 has been a tumultuous one to say the least. The global pandemic gave rise for us to pause and reflect on a number of fronts. Apart from our personal health and safety, and as a result of the recent pandemic, educational organizations have been challenged to scrutinize existing approaches to teaching and learning.

With the mandatory pivot to online learning systems, faculty, students, and leaders within learning communities have been challenged to re-consider longstanding educational pedagogies and ways of interacting. This dramatic and sudden change created increased concerns for the quality of educational offerings and research that in turn affect the credibility of the certificates, diplomas, and degrees conferred by post-secondary educational institutions. Specifically, worries have surfaced about the effectiveness of evaluations of learning through our current online delivery platforms. So, the annual International Day of Action (IDoA) against contract cheating, seemed an even more relevant and important undertaking in 2020.

The academic integrity community of practice was dealt a sad blow with the recent death of our Australian colleague Dr. Tracey Bretag. This IDoA took on a special meaning and relevance as it was devoted to the memory of Tracey. She was a tireless advocate for academic integrity and helped move us forward through her teaching, presentations, publications, and research. Her contributions to the field are nothing short of incredible and her spirit, positive energy, warm heart, and bright mind will be missed.

Contract cheating runs counter to academic integrity and is characterized by students outsourcing their academic work to third parties. The IDoA, sponsored by the International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI), marked its 5th international annual event on October 21, 2020 that coincided with the Carnegie Council's Global Ethics Day. From the IDoA 2020's inception, it was clear that there was strong interest to engage our global educational community to its fullest. International engagement was evident in a variety of ways.

An international planning committee was struck with content experts from around the

_____

world, and across the educational landscape. Content experts and researchers from primary educational and post-secondary educational sectors as well as educational quality assurance boards provided a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to the overall planning efforts for the IDoA. The planning committee included representation from Canada, Dubai, England, Greece, Ireland, and the United States (ICAI, 2020a). The aims and objectives for the 2020 IDoA were set by this group after careful discussion and consideration of various stakeholders and the current literature, research, and pressing issues related to contract cheating (ICAI, 2020b).

New to this year's IDoA was the addition of an international student planning group (ISPG). The ISPG boasted membership from 9 different parts of the world (Canada, Chile, Dubai, European Network, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, Ukraine, and United States). These students brought an energy, enthusiasm, and commitment to the aims and objectives for the IDoA and led an innovative social media campaign and kick-off to the live feed event that happened over a 20-hour period.

Their active involvement in planning student engagement leading up to and on the day, served to strengthen the connection with students around the world to the blight of contract cheating.

Additionally, the ICAI board awarded three prizes to students from Greece and the United States for their winning submissions to the *International Students Speaking Up for Integrity Creative Contest* (ICAI, 2020c).

The ICAI webpage was updated with current and relevant information about contract cheating, offering resources that can be easily downloaded for use around the world (ICAI, 2020b). The spotlight activity for the day was the live feed event entitled Twenty Live in 20 ~ Global Conversations about Contract Cheating. This live feed event occurred through Zoom and Facebook Live and offered opportunities for those interested in learning more about contract cheating to hear what was happening around the world. The live feed allowed us to connect across great distances and helped galvanize our efforts to speak up and out against contract cheating. A truly international effort of sharing ideas, potential resources, and current practices to combat contract cheating highlighted our strengths across the globe.

Canada's presence was obvious through the chair position on the international planning group, two student members, and the Canadian presentation at the virtual 20-hour live feed event. Canada's presentation included experts from seven provinces and provided a glimpse of some of the interprovincial collaboration currently happening around issues related to contract cheating and academic integrity. It is clear that Canada continues to grow stronger as a community of practice committed to the promotion of integrity across

the Canadian educational sector.

A record-breaking 250+ organizations registered for the day, which speaks to the relevance and interest around contract cheating and the preservation and promotion of academic integrity across our educational organizations. The IDoA was an opportunity and positive step to unite as a world committed to the quality of our educational endeavours but it is clear that this commitment and work needs to continue throughout the year. Dr. Camilla Roberts, President of the ICAI issued a statement against contract cheating letter (ICAI, 2020d) on October 21st that covers practical steps in our continued efforts to thwart contract cheating. The IDoA was meant to inspire and unite us, and we now have opportunities to collectively move forward with our efforts with renewed hope and fortitude.

References

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020a). *Planning committee for international day of action against contract cheating.* https://www.academicintegrity.org/idoa-committee/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020b). *International day of action against contract cheating.* https://www.academicintegrity.org/day-against-contract-cheating/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020c). 5th international day of action (IDoA) against contract cheating student creative contest. https://www.academicintegrity.org/2020-contest-winners/

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020d). Statement against contract cheating. https://www.academicintegrity.org/statement-against-contract-cheating/

Supporting the Pivot Online: Academic Integrity Initiatives at University of Waterloo

Erin Nearing, University of Waterloo

Keywords: academic integrity, Canada, COVID-19, reflection, resource development

As the University of Waterloo (UW) transitioned to online learning during the pandemic, several challenges emerged. Instructors had to rapidly pivot their courses to online delivery, many without previous experience, and students struggled to adapt to learning online. Extra pressures related to the pandemic, such as illness, financial instability, and mental health, affected the learning experience. However, the UW campus community worked hard to develop resources to support online teaching and learning and support a culture of academic integrity in a period of instability. Academic misconduct increased at institutions across the world, but more importantly, it brought academic integrity to the forefront of conversations. At UW, it led to the development of new academic integrity resources and the leveraging of existing resources.

Instructors were keen for guidance on how to promote academic integrity in online assessments. Although UW instructors have access to e-proctoring software, it is used by a very small percentage of instructors. Instead, the Office of Academic Integrity (OAI) encouraged instructors to use alternative assessment strategies and promoted best practices that help to reduce academic misconduct. Research shows that strategies such as low-stakes, frequent assessments, authentic assessments, and engaging students to create a positive instructor-student relationship can help reduce academic misconduct (Bretag et al., 2019). To guide instructors, the OAI, Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE), and Centre for Extended Learning (CEL) created and shared a tip sheet: "Academic Integrity in Online Exams Written During a Pandemic" (OAI, 2020), which outlines several tips related to prevention and assessment. Additionally, the OAI hosted a webinar on "Navigating Academic Integrity Issues in Online Teaching and Learning" (OAI, 2020), which featured a panel of UW Associate Deans, instructors and students who shared academic integrity best practices and assessment strategies. James Skidmore, Associate Professor and Director, Waterloo Centre for German Studies, in collaboration with CTE and CEL, also hosted webinars on "Reducing Cheating Online" and "Fostering Student Engagement Online" (Skidmore, 2020; 2020) to guide instructors in creating effective assessments and rich online learning experiences.

The above resources also emphasized the importance of clarifying expectations for each assessment, such as permitted and unauthorized aids, collaboration, and citation. To aid instructors in clarifying expectations online, an Associate Dean and the CTE created infographics

_____

indicating permitted and unauthorized aids for instructors to use on assessments (OAI, 2020). Additionally, instructors were encouraged to ask students to sign academic integrity agreements (OAI, 2020) for assignments and tests which listed the instructor's expectations for the course element. Research shows that signing an academic integrity form in a non-proctored environment can decrease instances of cheating (Ely et al., 2014). Being explicit about expectations and asking students to acknowledge those expectations aims to create a sense of accountability in an online environment.

Teaching Assistants (TAs) were also identified as an important group to support. The OAI had a long-term plan to target TAs by offering centralized academic integrity training. The shift online pushed us to prepare a workshop that supports TAs in navigating academic integrity in online courses. The OAI, the CTE, and the Student Success Office (SSO) began offering the workshop "Academic Integrity for TAs". The workshop reviewed ways in which a TA could promote academic integrity within their role, with a focus on some of the challenges they may face in the online environment. Important takeaways for TAs included proactively connecting students to campus resources, encouraging students to contact the instructor or TA for help, and appropriate responses to academic misconduct.

In addition, first-year students participated in "Waterloo Ready", a web-based initiative lead by the SSO to onboard students before they started the Fall Term, connect them to resources, and familiarize them with online learning. A module in Waterloo Ready, called "Academic Preparedness", centered on academic integrity. Students took a quiz on academic integrity to identify any knowledge gaps as they transitioned from high school to post-secondary. After completing the quiz, students reviewed "Academic Integrity for Students" (OAI, 2020), which breaks down expectations according to the six fundamental values of academic integrity from the International Center for Academic Integrity (2014). Students also completed an assignment, using resources from the OAI, the Writing and Communication Centre, and the Library, which gave students the opportunity to practice their skills before they began their studies, allowing them to identify areas for improvement and proactively connect with campus resources.

Although the pandemic has brought academic integrity to the forefront, a challenge when creating resources is ensuring they are used. The OAI has been actively identifying new ways to connect our campus community to these resources. For example, the OAI created an "Instructor Resource Repository" in our learning management system which allows instructors to easily access and implement our resources into their online courses. Additionally, the OAI has done frequent presentations online to students to bring them up to speed on academic integrity expectations and connect them with campus resources. The OAI will continue to try to link our campus community with these resources to leverage and expand the important work that has already been done.

References

Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newtown, P., & van Haeringen, K. (2019). Contract cheating and assessment design: exploring the relationship. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(5), 676-691.

Ely, J., Henderson, L., & Wachsman, Y. (2014). Testing the effectiveness of the university honor code. *Academic of Educational Leadership Journal, 18*(3), 95.

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2014). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (T. Fishman (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Clemson University. https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental values

Office of Academic Integrity. (2020). *Keep Learning with Integrity.* Academic Integrity. https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/keep-learning-integrity

Skidmore, J. (2020). *Fostering Student Engagement Online.* James Skidmore. https://www.jamesmskidmore.com/skidpresentations/fostering-student-engagement-online

Skidmore, J. (2020). *Reducing Cheating Online.* James Skidmore. https://www.jamesmskidmore.com/skidpresentations/reducing-cheating-online

Academic Integrity and the Pandemic

Mahdi Rahimian, Mohawk College

In Foucauldian philosophy, the discourse of a social phenomenon or event, or how it comes to be known, contributes to its understanding (McHoul & Grace, 1993). Knowing the background histories can help us understand the nature of the situation related to academic integrity during the pandemic of 2020. Although the spread of disease caused the pandemic, it influenced several non-medical sectors worldwide, including post-secondary education. Here, I will provide a synoptical background into the work of the Academic Integrity Office at Mohawk College, followed by steps taken to help to promote academic integrity values and practices.

Mohawk College's main campuses are in Hamilton, Ontario, and are "situated on the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabeg nations" (Mohawk College Land Acknowledgement). Mohawk College serves over 33,000 students, including 4,825 international students (Mohawk College Institutional Information, n.d.). When COVID-19 was officially declared in Canada and Ontario declared a state of emergency, it imposed a work from home mandate. The universities and colleges shut down their campuses while moving to teaching and learning online on short notice.

The Academic Integrity Office at Mohawk College started its work in September 2019, and we were in the process of undertaking multiple initiatives before the lockdown happened. We were in the process of publishing the academic integrity website under the library website, and a community of practice had been formed and met in January 2020 in hopes of meeting every other month. A few successful workshops were delivered for the faculty and staff, and we had several events for the students that received very positive feedback. The academic integrity officer had gone to several classes to educate students on academic integrity, and the college's academic integrity policy and framework were in development.

In the following sections, I explain three categories of challenges that we faced during the pandemic and how we attempted to solve them. These challenges are a few of the many that we faced as a result of the 2020 pandemic. However, I focus on these three major ones as they serve as the roots of other challenges.

Limited personal contact

The services that were offered in-person were stopped immediately and later resumed in a

limited capacity. For the first few months into the pandemic, the Library, Learning Support Centre, and Student Advising services moved to online support. Shutting down campuses caused limited access to academic integrity resources for the students and staff. For example, the academic integrity outreach programs were limited to sharing information online, mainly in email communications and publishing the website, online class visits, on-demand virtual support, and online meetings.

Increased demand for online education and online proctoring

The pandemic lockdown occurred in the second half of March 2020, while classes were getting close to final exams. One of the priorities for the Academic Integrity Office was finalizing the edits to the website in collaboration with the library technicians and staff and publishing the website so it would be available to students and staff. The efforts were maximized as everything was done remotely and added to the need for extra time and effective virtual communication. The website was published and provided information to students and faculty.

One of the initiatives at the Academic Integrity Office at Mohawk College was sharing information about e-proctoring and modifying assessments to increase academic integrity. Workshops for faculty were held to familiarize them with the techniques to promote academic integrity in virtual assessments and to hear their concerns and future needs. One of the requested areas for supporting faculty and staff to promote academic integrity was to help them design online courses in such a way as to promote academic integrity. Various resources were consulted, and the gist of findings was shared with the faculty via online communication with department chairs (i.e., associate deans at Mohawk College). Next, the information was shared on the website and the link was sent to the academic integrity community of practice. To enhance the instructors' intake of the material, I developed some workshops for faculty on designing online assessments that promoted academic integrity.

Another area of concern were file-sharing websites that posted assignments online, often without the instructors' permission. More instructors contacted the Academic Integrity Office about this issue than in the past, which may have been due to increased awareness of this issue as instructors moved their courses online and/or an increase in the volume of assignments that were uploaded to file-sharing websites. In collaboration with other institutions, the Academic Integrity Office established a takedown request protocol to ask these file-sharing websites to remove instructors' content from their platforms. This practice increased the office's workload, and some resources had to be allocated to follow up with such websites.

Use of technology

One of the observed trends during the pandemic was the substitution of in-class practices with virtual ones, which increased faculty workload and was not necessarily successful. We used the SAMR model to tackle the issue. In SAMR Model, *S* stands for substitution, *A* stands for

augmentation, *M* stands for modification, and *R* stands for redefinition (Puentedura, 2009; 2010). We observed that some of the challenges that faculty were facing might have been caused by trying to substitute in-person educational practices using virtual platforms, when modification (for example) may have been more appropriate. To clarify the point, I use some examples. For some courses before the pandemic, instructors required students to write an essay for their final in-person exam. The allocated time was between 90 to 120 minutes. Applying the same examination method using an online platform would be an example of substitution. In this case, the instructor would ask students to be online, use a virtual conference call platform (e.g., Zoom), and turn on their cameras. Then, the instructor would send the exam topic to the students and students would type their essays and submit it to their instructor within 90 to 120 minutes. However, if the instructor decided to break down the exam into three or four take home assignments, each bearing a certain percentage of the final exam; this would be an example of modification. The observation pointed the need for further education and training for the faculty memebers to teach online.

The actual practice of "so what" and "how" was the next challenge. For tackling those challenges, I applied my knowledge of education, combining principles of adult education with the experience and knowledge of integrating technology into education. This was followed by collaborations with the librarians and the college's Centre for Teaching and Learning. Group workshops and individual training sessions were held for faculty to learn about integrating technology into education appropriately and applying it to their courses. Having expertise in the education field and the scholarship of teaching and learning saved the day and provided much-needed and timely assistance.

To summarize, the pandemic of 2020 created an amalgamation of unprecedented situations, causing shifting priorities and issues to be tackled daily. The three categories of challenges— limited personal contact, increased demand for online education and online proctoring, and technology use—were some of the problematic areas. At the provincial level, we faced cancelling of conferences and events in some cases, and in other cases, moving events to online platforms such as using Zoom and Microsoft Teams.

On a final bright point, the pandemic showed the importance of expertise in education as a discipline and its contributions to every academic field when instruction does not go as planned. Investments (e.g., funding) in the scholarship of teaching and learning offered invaluable support through centres for teaching and learning. Many institutions often prioritize using people within specific fields such as engineering for performing educational development tasks. For example, appointing smeone with computer sciences background to help with the implementation of LMSs is not far from practice. Yet, the science of education and psychology of learning and instruction, if combined with educational technology experience and/or expertise, does benefit the post-secondary teaching practices in online education. Maybe in the future, we can learn from the

lessons and increase investments into these areas to support post-secondary education and specifically support academic integrity in our institutions.

References

McHoul, A. & Grace, W. (1993). *A Foucault primer: Discourse, power, and the subject*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Mohawk College (n.d.). College Dialogue - Mohawk College Institutional Information. Retrieved from https://www.mohawkcollege.ca/educator-resources/college-dialogues

Mohawk College (n.d.). Land Acknowledgement. Retrieved from https://www.mohawkcollege.ca/indigenous-students

Puentedura, R. R. (2009). SAMR: A brief introduction. unpublished. Retrieved from http://www. hippasus. com/rrpweblog/archives/2013/10/02/SAMR_ABriefIntroduction. pdf.

Puentedura, R. (2010). SAMR and TPCK: Intro to advanced practice. Retrieved from http://hippasus.com/resources/sweden2010/SAMR_TPCK_IntroToAdvancedPractice.pdf

Reflections on Academic Integrity During COVID-19

Cory Scurr, Conestoga College

Keywords: *academic integrity, assessment, Canada, contract cheating, COVID-19, reflection*

In July 2018, I started as Conestoga College's inaugural Academic Integrity Coordinator. The learning curve was steep. Conestoga had just launched their new online academic misconduct reporting system. It not only streamlined the filing process for faculty, which, I believe, removed a potential barrier (see also Prentice, 2020) to filing academic incidents, it also promoted College-wide consistency (especially as it pertains to issuing penalties and cultivating an educative and facilitative approach to academic integrity) and fairness for students working through an academic integrity breach, among other benefits.

Fast-forward nearly two years to when COVID-19 triggered a remote learning and working environment.

Higher education's reactionary, albeit necessary, switch to remote teaching and learning precipitated many anxieties about education in a fully remote environment. Reflecting on academic integrity during COVID-19, four noticeable features, or trends, stand out from my vantage point: 1) an assumption that cheating would automatically increase in a fully remote environment; 2) an increase in the polarizing perspectives on how to deal with or penalize academic misconduct; 3) a hyper-awareness of contract cheating and file-sharing sites (e.g., Course Hero and Chegg); and 4) a shift in how to best authenticate student work. Of course, these insights are not wholly original, and others have expressed similar observations.

What struck me most was what I initially interpreted as an assumption that cheating would be easier and more prevalent in a fully remote environment. Looking back, I believe this was more indicative of a general sense of uncertainty of the future and anxiety about the unknown. In unprecedented times, as indeed was the first-wave COVID-19 lockdown, I believe it was only natural for us to assume the worst. Faculty and administrators (myself included) wanted to know whether cheating would increase as a result of the new learning environment. I looked to works like Watson and Scottile (2010) and Harris et al. (2019) for answers. Watson and Scottile's study shows that "cheating in on-line courses is no more rampant than cheating in live classes" (p. 11). The authors did qualify this by stating, "the data showed that students were significantly more likely to obtain answers from others during an on-line test or quiz." This, they maintain, "presents problems for the standard lecture-based, test-driven course" (p. 11). This is echoed generally by Harris et al. in their more recent work where they maintain "that students at a large online university are no more likely to engage in most forms of cheating than the traditional-age

students in residential institutions" (2019, p. 419). While this may hold true for students in those contexts, there is one glaring caveat for students in the COVID-19 environment: they did not *choose* to study remotely. Alas, the world of education was flying blind. Essentially, this indicated that students and educators alike were feeling vulnerable.

From my vantage point, the world of unknowns had a polarizing effect on how faculty should handle penalties for academic misconduct, despite having in place a robust policy and procedure to guide our decisions. Some maintained (and I'm generalizing) that faculty should be more lenient and forgiving with students, given the unprecedented times and nascent struggles our students were facing, whereas others expressed a belief that the institution must "clamp down," so to speak, on potential cheating. The latter school of thought appeared to harbour a firm belief they had to protect the credential, as though it may be under siege. (The debate on the effectiveness and necessity of eProctoring services is a fine example of how a topic can provoke polarizing points of view. For a balanced and nuanced discussion on the benefits and limitations of eProctoring services, please see ICAI, 2020.) Again, these points of view are generalizations, but highlight well the very real concerns faculty had (and still have) as they navigate remote teaching.

It is possible that faculty may have been influenced by their immediate experiences. For instance, if a faculty recently worked through a plagiarism case, they may have been primed to lean towards the "protectionist" camp, whereas a more positive experience by another faculty may engender a push for compassion.

The truth is, both points of view are valid. As always, an institution must protect the integrity of its credential while simultaneously being cognizant of, and diligent in their efforts to mitigate, the struggles students face. These perspectives, of course, do not have to work in opposition to each other. COVID-19 happened to heighten our senses, at times causing some to appear at opposite ends. Not only did this new environment cause some to reflect on how to work through academic misconduct, but it awakened in many, and hyper-charged in others, the need to protect students from the seemingly ubiquitous contract cheating provider.

When I speak to those unfamiliar with contract cheating, their jaw tends to drop, expressing not only abhorrence but sometimes a disbelief in the practice. My institution has worked diligently over the past two years to create awareness and educate faculty and students about the dangers of contract cheating, framing it as the antithetical beast of academic integrity. Like a hungry predator, though, the contract cheating industry targets students, and the COVID-19 context whetted its appetite.

Whether true or not, like the popular assumption that cheating would increase due to remote learning, the notion that contract cheating specifically would rise precipitously was a very real concern among many. As a result, a "hyper-awareness" of the practice seemed to spread among

faculty and the institution at large. Additionally, faculty appeared to be monitoring, more than ever, file-sharing sites for material that should not be posted. Of course, this practice may have been a natural or progressive result of a growing awareness of these sites, rather than positively correlated to the switch to remote delivery. Regardless, it seems the COVID-19 world triggered in many an awareness of the threat contract cheating brings to education. How to best mitigate this threat is of utmost importance as we strive to authenticate student assessment.

My last observation is regarding the seemingly aggressive shove, given by our shift to remote delivery, to develop and expand (at break-neck speed) authentic assessments. Authentic assessment design is not new, yet our switch to remote delivery seemed to create a sense of urgency for it to be fully integrated into course delivery. Adjustments to courses to reduce traditional testing methods has led some to think outside the box, leading to some innovative strategies. While transforming assessments has indeed been exhausting for many, the "short-term pain for long-term gain" adage will certainly pay off, I think. This has highlighted how integral academic integrity is to course design and showcases the passion and dedication so many faculty have for their students and the programs in which they teach.

As we settle into the new normal, our lived experiences of remote education in a COVID-19 environment will provide a useful lens through which we can learn about our personal and institutional values. The trends we encountered will help highlight areas of improvement and excellence. We have much to learn from, reflect on, and build toward. One thing is for certain: as we move forward, we must do so with integrity.

References

Harris, L., Harrison, D., McNally, D., & Ford, C. (2019). Academic integrity in an online culture: Do McCabes's finding's hold true for online, adult learners? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, http://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09335-3.

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2020, November 19). To eProctor or not to eProctor: That is the question. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hJBPM8UIw5I.

Prentice, F. (2020). Impediments to reporting contract cheating: exploring the role of emotions. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *A Research Guide for Academic Integrity* (pp. 69-85)*.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Watson, G.R., & Scottile, J. (2010). Cheating in the digital age: Do students cheat more in online courses? *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *13*(1). http://mds.marshall.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=eft_faculty

Reflection on Academic Integrity during COVID-19

Josh Seeland, Assiniboine Community College, Brandon, MB, Canada

Keywords: academic integrity, COVID-19, Canada, reflection

Beyond the widely addressed challenges and problems associated with the ongoing COVID-19 situation, there may be a few windfalls. For those of us working in the world of academic integrity, the pandemic has been a catalyst in thrusting research evidence to the front burners of post-secondary education. More than a few of us, myself included, saw what was for years a leviathan on the sides of our desk become an official job title during this year. We quickly found ourselves connecting with others from coast to coast on what has and hasn't been working in the field over the past few years. On a weekly basis, we have attended and delivered webinars, synthesizing new information, and finding congruence across borders and between colleges and universities.

Both seminal and newer literature has kept us focused during these unprecedented times. For example, Mellar et al. (2018) addressed a holistic and well-rounded academic integrity program in the importance of various cumulative levers: policy and processes, assessment design, blocking cheating sites, and assessment security technologies, such as e-proctoring software. This in itself represents a more detailed development of fundamental ideas such as those given by Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) and Bertram Gallant (2008). Indeed, when and if we take the time to step back and reflect, many of us saw encouraging signs of a successful cultural shift this year. Seeing instructors implement assessment design strategies to promote academic integrity in online learning environments continues to provide us with new evidence each term. Integrating the academic integrity perspective with those of educational technology and IT services when making informed and measured decisions in regards to the adoption of assessment security software validates pre-COVID considerations.

As the pandemic continues to morph and occupy so much of our lives, the benefits of a positive, supportive, proactive, and educative outlook towards academic integrity has provided a much-needed anchor. Negativity and incidents of misconduct can often obscure our vision. The incessant and alarmist marketing of "ed tech" companies would have us believe that their products are a panacea. Similarly, predatory file-sharing and contract cheating platforms circle like vultures, preying on stressed students with offers of help and appeals to the commodification of education.

We can look to not only our invaluable researchers – both with us and departed – but to organizations and allied individuals for inspiration. The Quality Assurance Agency in the UK and Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency in Australia, for example, provide guidance to the entire post-secondary education sector around the globe. And as a learned colleague put it, everything we do in academic integrity is *for* our students, it is not done to them.

References

Bertram Gallant, T. (2008). *Academic integrity in the 21st century*. Jossey-Bass.

Mellar, H., Peytcheva-Forsyth, R., Kocdar, S., Karadeniz, A., & Yovkova, B. (2018). Addressing cheating in e-assessment using student authentication and authorship checking systems: teachers' perspectives, *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 14*(2), 1-21.

Whitley, B.E., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: an educator's guide.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Academic Integrity and the Pandemic

Paul Sopcak, MacEwan University

> "Education without values, as useful as it is, seems rather
> to make [hu]man a more clever devil."
> — C. S. Lewis

As I am writing this short piece, not only the province of Alberta, but the entire world is barreling toward an ever more precarious situation regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. It is rather disheartening to see the degree to which, at least in this part of the world, mis- and dis-information, ruthless power politics, as well as a lack of trust in science have and continue to exacerbate the situation. The crisis of values that many parts of the world are experiencing, paired with the health crisis, seem to have created the perfect storm. How is the current self-understanding of postsecondary institutions related to the post-truth climate of "alternative facts", and what role does or might academic integrity play in rectifying this distrust of learning, facts, and truth? A direct impact of COVID-19 for me has been that these two questions have gained in urgency and become increasingly concrete over the past ten months. Another impact has been an invigorated passion for my work in academic integrity, as well as the renewed appreciation for and connection with my colleagues.

It is well-documented by now that the unexpected and rushed move of courses to an online environment that were designed to be delivered face-to-face resulted in a spike of academic misconduct cases globally. Although it is perhaps not surprising, it is discouraging. However, the determination, generosity, and collegiality that all those involved in responding to these cases at my institution have shown has been remarkable. From members of the Student's Association of MacEwan University and faculty members volunteering to participate in restorative resolutions, to faculty adjudicators and the Student Conduct Officer working long hours in dealing with the large number of cases, all rose to meet the challenge of the moment.

Then there is the work with the Library, E-Learning Office, and Teaching and Learning Centre in developing workshops, webinars, and resource materials all aimed at assisting faculty members and students in transitioning to remote instruction with integrity. Committees looking at how to address contract cheating, and whether to implement text matching and e-proctoring software. All these interactions not only drew attention to the importance of academic integrity on campus, but they also strengthened the sense of community that is so important to integrity and flourishing.

The most significant impact in this regard, however, has been the shaping of a true Canadian community of practice through the weekly *Integrity Hour*, hosted by Sarah Elaine Eaton from the University of Calgary. Every Monday morning, a group made up of faculty and staff working in academic integrity has met virtually to discuss challenges and developments, as well as to generously share resources and expertise. I'm convinced that the circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic contributed to shaping this community, which is also a community of values.

So, as tumultuous and tragic as these past months have been, they have also been productive and have provided us with an opportunity to assess whether how we've been doing things is necessarily the only or best way to do things. The pandemic has been a reminder of the privilege those of us working at postsecondary institutions have to promote and foster integrity in our students and of the responsibility we have to tie education to values that go beyond "employability." The fundamental values of academic integrity, as defined by the International Center for Academic Integrity (2014), namely *honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility,* and *courage*, are a good starting point to pursue Article 26 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*: "Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

References

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2014). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (T. Fishman (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Clemson University. https://www.academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values

United Nations General Assembly. (10 December, 1948). Universal declaration of human rights. 217 A (III). https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

Educational Challenges of 2020 and Hope for 2021

Brenda M. Stoesz, University of Manitoba

The year 2020 began much like any other year with hopes for a new beginning and the commitment to resolutions. By late January and early February when our motivations to keep our resolutions faded away, COVID-19 appeared in conversations with colleagues, friends, and family as a problem only experienced by individuals in a distant land. Little did we know that after the 2020 International Conference of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) held in March in Portland, Oregon, our lives would change in dramatic and sometimes frightening ways because of the rapid spread of this virus to North America.

As an incoming co-editor in chief of the *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity* to work alongside co-founder and co-editor in chief, Brandy Usick, I reflect upon the early days of the pandemic and the many events that have followed. It has been a year filled with an unexpectedly fast-paced ride of new demands and new fears. In my work as a Faculty Specialist (Academic Integrity) at The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, University of Manitoba, I have experienced an over 1,200% increase in the number of consultations with faculty members and sessional instructors, workshops, and presentations than in previous years. It may be safe to assume that the pandemic and the shift to online learning has motivated academic staff to seek ways to educate their students about academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct in their new remote teaching and learning environments.

The job of educators has not been easy during this pandemic as fears of rampant cheating abound, including concerns that contract cheating services are in higher demand (e.g., Newton, 2020). Established ways of teaching and assessing students' learning have also been disrupted, forcing educators to rethink their practices (see Gamage et al., 2020) and often looking to 'authentic' assessment to design out cheating, but which are not immune to cheating (Ellis, et al., 2020). COVID-19 has been a game changer for faculty members and sessional instructors, and importantly, it has changed how and where students learn. Students have also been required to navigate the new reality of completing courses in an environment that they had not anticipated and may not even prefer, which can be frustrating, stressful, and disorienting. The situation is not unique to teaching and learning, as our lives beyond the virtual classroom are markedly different than they were at this time just one year ago – the anxiety related to health and well-being and the socio-economic consequences of this pandemic are very real (Taylor et al., 2020).

Despite the chaos, I feel that I have been fortunate (at least so far). I am grateful for my health and the health of my family, and that I have a job that allows me to work from the safety of my home office. Because of these feelings of safety and security, I dare to imagine that 2021 will bring opportunities to move away from the "fight or flight" response to academic misconduct toward new ways to teach that encourage deep learning, new ways to assess learning, and new ways to support all members of educational communities to uphold the values of honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage. Now is the time to set high expectations for 2021.

References

Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., Rozenberg, P., Newton, P., & Saddiqui, S. (2020). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(3), 454-469. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1680956

Gamage, K. A. A., de Silva, E. K., & Gunawardhana, N. (2020) Online delivery and assessment during COVID-19: Safeguarding academic integrity. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 301. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10110301

Newton, D. (2020, August 7). Another problem with shifting education online: Cheating. The Hechinger Report. https://hechingerreport.org/another-problem-with-shifting-education-online-cheating/

Rossiter, S. (2020, June 21). Cheating becoming an unexpected COVID-19 side effect for universities. CBC. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/cheating-becoming-an-unexpected-covid-19-side-effect-for-universities-1.5620442

Taylor, S., Landry, C. A., Paluszek, M. M., Fergus, T. A., McKay, D., & Asmundson, G. J. G. (2020). Development and initial validation of the COVID Stress Scales. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *72*, 1-7 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102232

Reflections on COVID-19 and Academic Integrity

Nazanin Teymouri, NorQuest College

Sheryl Boisvert, NorQuest College

Keywords: academic integrity, assessment, Canada, COVID-19, reflection

Reflecting on our individual experiences and the effects of COVID-19 on academic integrity at NorQuest College, common themes were uncertainty, unforeseen challenges, and eventually, innovation. Within the business programs, instructors were quick to come together and to offer one another support and ideas to ensure the integrity of evaluations. Although factors such as delivery platforms and assessment types posed different issues for each instructor based on their specific courses, eventually the College stepped in with guidelines on how to collectively make it through the semester.

Initially, there was a great deal of uncertainty about whether courses would move to full on-line delivery and what would come of final exams. The conversation between instructors immediately turned to assessments and discussions on how to maintain the integrity of assignments and exams. Initially, nearly all instructors requested to have online proctoring services for the remaining exams. It soon became clear that would not happen. Everyone knew that with little time to plan for changes to course delivery and the shift to online exams, academic integrity was at risk. Two distinct perspectives came out of these discussions: those who believed there was no point in stressing over managing academic integrity and those who were not prepared to let it be compromised.

The challenge of finding a middle ground between these two perspectives was new to all of us as educators and the institution. Some instructors contacted publishers to ask if it was possible to strengthen controls on assessments offered through their online platforms, others simply prepared paper exams to be taken online. The issue of controlling cheating and plagiarism was just a small part of the discussion. Instructors worried that factors such as a lack of devices between students, allowing for extensions, and the inability to meet with students would compromise the integrity of their assignments. How could a student be expected to submit an assignment online if they did not have a reliable device at home? How could we know they were telling the truth or if they taking advantage of the situation? Arguments over how to maintain fairness between evaluations turned to a discussion of how to manage the specific challenges faced by each student within each class.

Before final exams, the College stepped in with unprecedented policies and guidelines on managing courses and assessments. The aim was to ensure that no student would be left behind. All programs were told to allow for extensions and deferrals on assignments. Our department was directed to allow for open books on all assessments. The controls that were suggested for evaluations were timing, shuffling, and randomizing questions. Some instructors used alternative assessments such as presentations instead of exams. While this seemed like a terrible idea, we noted there was little to no noticeable change in scores on evaluations compared to previous semesters. However, some instructors noticed their class average increase substantially.

We are still in the process of trying new services, procedures, and tactics to limit the possibility of misconduct. The most certain lesson from this experience is that when the well-being of learners and instructors came before the need to police our assessments, the system did not break down. Our students continued to learn and our efforts as educators did not go to waste.

Reflections from a Novice Academic Integrity Researcher During COVID-19

Emma J. Thacker, Keele University, University of Toronto

When I was accepted into a Doctor of Education (EdD) program, I could not have imagined that all of my data collection would occur during a global pandemic. I had enthusiastically submitted my research ethics application for approval in January of 2020 and was ready to begin interviews by the end of February. In March, when the pandemic became an exigent reality in Toronto, Canada, I began working exclusively from home and this included my doctoral work. At that time, I had one small collaborative research project underway, and my doctoral research about to begin. Both projects are related to academic integrity in Canada, and both stalled immediately. Now what!? COVID-19 restrictions posed several challenges for me as a student researcher, however, as I adapted, I began to realize that it also provided some unexpected opportunities.

My doctoral research is surrounding contract cheating, also known as academic outsourcing (Awdry, 2020; Clarke & Lancaster, 2007). My methods are qualitative in approach, with in-depth interviews as my main tool for data collection. I had planned to schedule some face-to-face interviews and use technology for interviews when the distance was too great. I was fortunate that the quick shift to an entirely online environment suited my research methods and objectives, and that my overall research goals were not impeded. Although the pace at which I was collecting data slowed and even came to a grinding halt for about eight weeks, I was able to slowly pick things back up and begin to seek out and schedule interviews online. Over the months of the pandemic, to manage my day job, it was necessary to engage more deeply with information and communication technology (ICT). For example, I needed to become proficient with new online communication platforms and at hosting large governance meetings using video conference software (e.g., Zoom). Academic governance meetings are often attended by 50+ members of the academic community. This crash course in online meeting management provided me with the foundation, and later expertise, to confidently conduct my research interviews online, making the most of the technology to support my research. As my experience grew, I felt confident in my skills to record, ensure privacy, confidentiality, and develop trust and rapport with interview participants in an online space.

While my digital interview skills were growing, many questions arose related to the pandemic and my research. For example, how would faculty respond to a request for an interview during this time of unprecedented crisis? I had more than one faculty member, understandably, decline

an interview and express that they were immersed in creating online courses and responding to changes to their teaching and research practices. How would students feel about discussing cheating during this time? The media was flooded with stories about the rise of misconduct and the contested use of online exam proctoring. Had COVID-19 increased or decreased my potential pool of contract cheating assignment providers (also known as ghostwriters)? Had COVID-19 changed the very phenomenon I was about to research? As my interviews began to unfold and themes began to emerge, I started to have an appreciation that this flux is part of the nature of social research. Researchers must be able to roll with the dynamic nature of their research topics and consider new, unforeseen variables. Navigating change in my research project was refining and enhancing my skills as a researcher. As it turned out, ghostwriters, faculty, and students were willing to participate in the project, although I did strategically time my faculty interview invitations a few weeks into the summer semester to take advantage of that *slightly* less stressful period of time.

A last opportunity provided by the pandemic is regarding the digital landscape as it relates to academic integrity and misconduct. Although my research had always queried the role of technology and academic integrity, the pandemic swiftly moved this concept into the foreground. This shifted the representation of technology in the research plan, but also potentially advanced the need for the research results. Understanding the role of technology and digital literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2008) in higher education had suddenly never been greater. As it stands today, in the second week of November 2020, I have just completed my data collection. I had originally planned to complete the interviews by August 30, 2020. The other collaborative project is just now starting to get off the ground again. I am working at not being too hard on myself. My next step is to complete transcriptions and begin my data analysis and writing. It is exciting and also overwhelming. We are all still navigating the ever-changing landscape of education due to COVID-19; however, I am grateful for the lessons learned and opportunities as a novice academic integrity researcher.

References

Awdry, R. (2020). Assignment outsourcing: Moving beyond contract cheating. *Journal of Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1765311

Clarke, R., & Lancaster, T. (2007-07-26). Establishing a systematic six-stage process for detecting contract cheating. *2007 2nd International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Applications*. (pp. 342–347). https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPCA.2007.4365466.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel. M. (2008). *Digital literacies: Concepts, policies and practices*. Peter Lang Publishing.

_____

My Journey to Becoming an Academic Integrity Specialist

Lisa Vogt, Red River College

I began 2020 as an EAL Specialist, supporting students who speak English as an Additional Language (EAL), in a three-year college diploma program. Most of the students I was working with were international students, who had left their home countries and moved to Canada to study. Others were permanent residents or Canadians, and all needed help building the language skills required for their programs and workplaces. The role was enjoyable and meaningful, and I was nearing 20 years of professional work in the field of English language teaching and support for newcomers to Canada.

Three years earlier, I had taken on a small contract at my college, which involved qualitative and quantitative research on academic misconduct among international students. It was not a topic to which I had given much thought prior to taking on the project. In the four months I spent completing the research, I couldn't determine conclusively why rates of academic misconduct were statistically higher among international students, compared to domestic students. Nor could I shake the memory of emotionally raw students who spoke of broken relationships with instructors and classmates after being reported for academic misconduct. I referred multiple students to counselling, some not able to finish our discussion before running out of the room. I knew then that there is more to academic misconduct than teaching students about plagiarism.

In June 2017, as I was wrapping up my research report, I attended the first Academic Integrity Inter-Institutional Meeting (AIIIM) for Manitoba post-secondary institutions. On that day, I connected with instructors, support staff, and faculty development leaders who were looking at academic integrity holistically, as a responsibility held by the entire institution. That day was a game-changer for me, as I realized that post-secondary institutions were reframing the way we teach academic integrity and respond to academic misconduct.

After submitting my report, academic integrity remained as a side-of-desk project. In 2018, I spoke at the second AIIIM, sharing my observations of the shame response expressed by students in my research. I posed the question – Could destructive shame be transformed into productive guilt? This question caught the attention of others, and a cross-institutional collaboration began in hopes of understanding the international student experience more deeply.

In the years that followed, I integrated these new perspectives into my work with students, looking for themes on what makes students successful and what might lead students away from

_____

academic integrity. I connected with colleagues who were also interested in building academic integrity into their work, and found not only instructors, but also librarians, academic specialists, and accommodation specialists eager to support integrity in their work. At every opportunity, I advocated for a coordinated institutional approach to academic integrity, and I connected with provincial and national community practitioners and researchers.

When COVID-19 caused the college to quickly pivot to remote learning, I did all I could to support the cohort of international students with whom I had worked. Faculty were concerned about cheating, and I spoke to senior leadership to encourage clear institutional expectations for students in the remote learning context. At the start of September 2020, I received notice that the enrolment of international students in my assigned program was too low to fund an EAL Specialist. COVID-19, which brought about travel restrictions and health concerns, had cut the expected number of international students in half, and about a third of those who enrolled remained in their home countries. I was laid off.

For 2.5 years, I had been advocating for a dedicated academic integrity position, and the director in our area had been working to make this a reality, noting that remote learning likely sped up the process by making academic integrity a high profile discussion. The time had come to give my attention to that side-of-desk project, which had already been creeping its way into every workday. I became the first Academic Integrity Specialist at my college, and one of a small number who hold that role in Canadian post-secondary. I entered the position with over 3 years' experience in the academic integrity community but started from scratch in building a coordinated institutional response at my college. I have set broad goals for my first year that include revision of academic integrity policy, growing capacity through a committee of stakeholders, and creating practical resources for students and staff. It is no small task, and after each week, I turn off my computer (which is situated between my dining room and living room) and take stock of what has been accomplished. The leaders in my department remind me that the work is a marathon and not a sprint.

I could not have expected the direction my career would take when I graduated from post-secondary 20 years ago. My core goal of teaching and learning has remained the same, but my work has flexed to meet demands. A significant cultural shift, fueled by technology, has changed our lives in the past two decades. It is the reason we are now able to operate colleges and universities from our homes. As always, the responsibilities of a post-secondary institution go beyond delivering subject matter and assessing knowledge; we are developing students into leaders, professionals, and scholars. Building integrity into learning will continue to be important in the coming years, and although an Academic Integrity Specialist can guide the initiative, it will take a village to achieve it.

The COVID Cloud's Ag Lining

Bronwen Wheatley, University of Calgary

My first concern for academic integrity, as I imagined the task of assessing 800 students in the Fall 2020 (September - December) semester offering of CHEM 201, one of the University of Calgary's (U of C) first-year university general chemistry courses, was how to hold fair exams. After attending many meetings addressing academic integrity (see also Raje & Stitzel, 2020), I was convinced that a completely open-resource approach to the course – open-resource with the exception of consulting other people during exams – would be the best model for CHEM 201. Such a course would help students learn how to research "the answers" for themselves and also how to cite these sources.

I taught at the U of C during the Winter 2020 (January - April) semester. I prepared two versions of that course's final exam, and several cases of academic misconduct came to light because student responses did not answer the question asked on that student's paper, but instead answered a question from the other exam version. My experience in April 2020 revealed, among other things, the challenge of distinguishing between the potential academic misconduct of a student copying material directly off an online resource (the extent to which this type of copying, without citation, is not allowed on an exam was not well-established for the April 2020 cohort), and the very serious academic misconduct of one student copying answers from another student, one who had copied material directly off an online resource. The exam questions were original in their creation and the exam itself had been open-resource, so while students were free to consult their notes and search the internet for support, the only provenance of the answers from the wrong version of the exam would have been classmates. From Friday, March 13, 2020, when the U of C changed from face-to-face to online courses, until the exam period in April, there had been limited time to create new online norms or to support students' online research skills and, in combination with many other factors, the result was academic misconduct.

As the Summer semester faded and the Fall semester approached, I believed that the traditional high-stakes exams were too much pressure for the CHEM 201 teaching team to hold and for students to contemplate in these unprecedented times. Therefore, an unprecedented course outline with a grade breakdown of ~10% for each item of coursework – whether it was an online laboratory report, tutorial work, or an exam – was written and approved. In CHEM 201, there would be no low-stakes assessments, but also no high-stakes assessments. Every piece of coursework was written to take approximately the same amount of time and involve the same amount of effort. Moreover, students' lowest tutorial score and lowest laboratory score would be

excluded from the overall course grade calculation, so students who were ill or who experienced family tragedies were not pressured to complete additional work once they were able to resume their studies. It was hoped that this flexible course outline would minimize student stress and avoid placing students in positions where they might make poor decisions concerning academic integrity. Both online laboratory activities and online tutorial activities were designed to require only as much time as was Registrar-scheduled; for example, no work was to be turned in a week after the activity was held. Attention then turned to the exams.

When thinking about how to hold the two midterms and a final exam with academic integrity, I remembered how the insect pheromones synthesized in some U of C undergraduate laboratory experiments (Henrick, Carney, & Anderson, 1982) could be used in mating disruption in agriculture (Lance et al., 2016). When the pheromone of an insect is spread in trace quantities over an entire crop, insects of the opposite sex can no longer locate each other. In short, by flooding the system with a chemical used for communication, communication broke down. In a similar way, I hoped to create so many exam versions that attempts by students to collect them all and collaborate in unauthorized ways would prove challenging during the exam's time constraints.

My co-instructor agreed with this plan, and we developed exam questions for the midterms. All exam questions had some feature that allowed for the creation of many versions, and all version possibilities were collected in a single document that was used to initiate the creation of all the exam versions. That one version of the exam with all the question options would be copied and those copies were given distinct filenames, then the first question on each of those files would be altered to ask about a single item. For example, the first exam question might read "What is the ground state electron configuration for Ti^{3+} / V^{3+} / Cr^{3+}?" in the original exam document and this would become:

> "What is the ground state electron configuration for Ti^{3+}?" in the Version 1 file
> "What is the ground state electron configuration for V^{3+}?" in the Version 2 file
> "What is the ground state electron configuration for Cr^{3+}?" in the Version 3 file

Those files in turn would all be copied two or three times, and the second question altered; this process would proceed until different options had been used for all exam questions. The first midterm had five questions in total and 34 versions were made; the second midterm had six questions in total and 37 versions were made.

These files then had to be distributed. The student class list could be sorted by first name, by last name, or by ID number, and one of these sorting methods was selected for each exam. Student e-mail addresses were copied from the class list in batches, and mass e-mails were written with students blind carbon-copied. For each new e-mail message, the exam paper's filename had to be changed to a generic "First Midterm" or "Second Midterm" so that a detailed filename would not allow students to match versions. The instructions for writing the exam and its submission were

in the e-mail message, and the exam paper was attached. In anticipation of grading, students were manually assigned to their class list-based groups in the U of C's learning management system, Desire2Learn (D2L). This would allow members of the CHEM 201 grading team to just click from one student to the next while grading, instead of searching for each individual student's submission. Ultimately, the creation of the e-mail messages and the D2L groups took several hours. Some students had to be removed from their original batches and assigned to new ones, due to scheduling conflicts caused by the CHEM 201 midterms being held outside of class time.

The U of C requires instructors to provide accommodations to students who are in other time zones, as we have students from all around the globe taking our online courses. This meant that the midterm exams were released over a 27-hour period for the first midterm and a 40-hour period for the second midterm. The U of C guidelines also instituted an additional 50% of the set exam time in case of technical difficulties. Each midterm was designed to last 80 minutes, with 40 minutes additional allowance for difficulties uploading to the system.

In contrast with the two exam versions that were traditionally used for the two midterms in face-to-face settings of CHEM 201, the creation of approximately three dozen versions of an exam was extremely time-consuming. Instead of exams being distributed in person in about fifteen minutes before an exam room was opened to students, hours were devoted to creating e-mails with the correct version associated with the correct batch of students. Instead of spending two or three hours invigilating students writing in a few large rooms at the U of C, someone from the CHEM 201 teaching team had to be available by e-mail during the entire time the exams were being completed. Instead of sorting the exams quickly into "Version A" or "Version B", traditionally distinguished with coloured paper or some identifying front-page image, students had to be manually assigned into different groups on D2L. In short, time that could have been spent answering student queries, creating sample practice materials, developing questions or exercises for lecture, laboratory, or tutorial, were instead devoted to creating this complex system revolving around more than thirty exam versions. The exam versions, due to their creation method, might also be identical except for the very last question. There was considerable concern that the exam could be compromised at any time over the broad range of exam release times. There was no way to control or monitor students' use of the two hours provided, to prevent students from using more than 80 minutes to answer exam questions. The exam questions' creativity was limited partly by the need for them to readily generate multiple versions, but also for fear of copy/paste errors.

These difficulties do not, I believe, overshadow the benefits this system offered to students, who had extensive opportunities to learn how to perform targeted internet searches and to cite their sources properly. For example, the references for face-to-face semester laboratory reports had been identical from one student to the next: the laboratory manual, the technicians, students' lab partners, and perhaps a journal article consulted for a specific constant. This semester, students

were encouraged to explore chemistry concepts on their own. Students should have found that there are many online resources that are suitable for CHEM 201 purposes, that some resources are deemed better (more reliable, more specific) than others, and that even reliable websites have their limitations. Some course exercises were even designed to showcase that online searching can lead to dead ends! It is hoped that students were able to use those research skills under the time constraints of each midterm exam.

The exam-manufacturing process did compete with student queries about chemistry, but it was important to address issues concerning academic integrity with as much due diligence possible. It was vital that the CHEM 201 teaching team provide exams that students could write using their research skills and without engaging in academic misconduct. I choose to see the silver lining of the COVID cloud; I believe that students this semester recognized that the teaching team made the effort to address academic integrity throughout all course components. I also believe our students developed research and citation skills that should stand them in good stead, in both future online courses and in-person courses, when face-to-face courses resume.

References

Henrick, C. A., Carney, R. L., & Anderson, R. J. (1982). Some aspects of the synthesis of insect dex pheromones. In Beroza, M., Leonhardt, B. A. (Eds). Washington, D.C.: American Chemical Society, pp. 27-60.

Lance, D. R., Leonard, D. S., Mastro, V. C., & Walters, M. L. (2016). Mating disruption as a suppression tactic in programs targeting regulated lepidopteran pests in US. *Journal of Chemical Ecology,* 42, 590–605. https://doi-org/10.1007/s10886-016-0732-9

Raje, S., & Stitzel, S. (2020). Strategies for effective assessments while ensuring academic integrity in general chemistry courses during COVID-19. *Journal of Chemistry Education*, *97*(9), 3436–3440. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00797

Faculty Development and Academic Integrity
During Pandemic Times

Karla L. Wolksy, Lethbridge College, Lethbridge, Alberta

Melanie J. Hamilton, Lethbridge College, Lethbridge, Alberta

Since COVID-19 turned academia on its head in the spring of 2020, we were forced to take a step back and reflect on our current teaching practices, including course content, teaching strategies, and practice-based experiences. Some instructors focused on the use of technology, others debated the merits of synchronous versus asynchronous delivery, and many talked about the impact on students academically and personally. Although all of these were also a concern for us, academic integrity was at the forefront, igniting us to brainstorm what types of academic integrity conversations we would need to have with instructors in the upcoming months.

We noticed that instructors often defaulted to 'how students will cheat in this environment' or 'how students will take advantage of this situation' as common comments in conversations. Some of these conversations were no different than the ones we previously had with instructors about assessments. However, what we have seen has become a concern as authentic assessments are being passed over for multiple-choice exams to try and curtail any academic dishonesty resulting from students completing these exams at home. Applications, such as e-proctoring software, have been used by some instructors to try to stop any academic dishonesty from occurring. We have seen a significant increase in student stress levels related to being recorded in their homes on top of the uncertain COVID environment. Students have identified that their exams online have become taxing due to the use of e-proctoring software, limited time to write the exam (to prevent opportunities for cheating), and the sheer number of multiple-choice exams they are writing. Although academic integrity is a significant issue and should be considered in the context of all course assessments, we must not forget that our students are already under a considerable amount of stress, and further adding to this to control academic dishonesty may not be the best tactic for student success.

More than ever, instructors require professional development around formal assessments and how to continue to implement authentic assessments in an online environment in a way that minimizes the potential for cheating. However, trying to create professional development around academic integrity has also become a challenge in the ever-changing COVID environment. Instructors are feverishly trying to transition their courses online, looking for alternative

practice-based experiences, and creating new online assessments, all the while concerned about the integrity of their exams. We hear that instructors are exhausted and have admittedly noted that it is impossible to shift their existing evaluations online and consider switching to assessments that have a decreased chance of academic integrity violations, such as multiple-choice exams using an online proctoring application. Although numerous conversations have occurred at all levels within our institution around preventing academic dishonesty within the online environment, more questions than answers arise. There is more work to do for the foreseeable future as we continue to learn how to uphold academic integrity in online environments. As academic integrity researchers delve into this topic, we must also ask which types of authentic assessments best support student learning versus the capabilities of these assessments to cultivate a culture of academic integrity online.

Reducing Plagiarism and Improving Writing: A Lesson from Chinese Painting

Dennis Rovere, University of Calgary

Abstract

Both research and experience has established that plagiarism is a relatively common feature in L2 writing. This is the result of several factors, including lack of understanding of the original material, limitations in academic vocabulary, time constraints, and so on. Although there are specific sanctioned instances where copying and presenting works as your own in cultures such as Chinese, plagiarism is never allowed. How then can a university level writing instructor overcome the confusion this creates among groups such as Chinese L2 students? In response to this question, the author proposes a theoretical model, based upon a traditional analytical framework for Chinese painting – where copying is a requirement. This model mimics the Six Principles proposed by Hsieh He's [or Xiè Hè's – 謝赫] in 520 AD. By modifying, translating, and directly applying these Six Principles to writing, students can better learn how to avoid plagiarism, gain a greater understanding of the material they are reading, and develop ways to better express themselves.

Keywords: L2 writing, plagiarism, reducing plagiarism, theoretical writing model, analytical tools, writing instruction, Chinese painting principles, ESL, Canada, Canadian university, practitioner, patchwriting

Reducing Plagiarism and Improving Writing: A Lesson from Chinese Painting

> "Plagiarism (noun): the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own."
>
> *Oxford Dictionary*

As a writer, editor, and an experienced academic writing tutor at a major Canadian research university I have, over the years, seen numerous examples of plagiarized material in essays, group reports, research papers, and even theses. This is often a situation among ESL students especially from China. My observations are not unique. As Pecorari (2015) noted, "It is now well established that plagiarism is a relatively common feature in much L2 writing" (p. 94). There is often a misconception in the West regarding the Chinese cultural attitude towards copying as an accepted practice. While there are legitimate reasons for this thinking, plagiarism is never allowed in academic settings.

In my experience, most plagiarism is unintentional. It typically takes the form of 'patch- writing'. Here, a common problem is the inability to express an understanding of the reference material in the student's own words. This can either stem from a lack of understanding, lack of an adequate vocabulary, or a lack of organization necessary to expand the ideas.

However, some of the plagiarism is deliberate. This typically consists of copying other's work (verbatim) and presenting it as their own. Alternately, students mix unattributed work with their own writing to pretend the work is original. The former is often easily recognized because of a change in writing style or vocabulary. In the latter, it is often identified via awkward sentence construction as the student attempts to meld the different material. When confronted with possible plagiarism, some students simply lie and say it is their own work. If this occurs, I remind them to ensure it is truly their writing and that I am required, by department and university regulations to submit the suspect piece to the department librarian for analysis. Others, when asked, 'confess' and give reasons such as:

- The need to meet a tight deadline (faster to copy).
- Not understanding the material. Here, the student presents another's work to create a perceived level of understanding.
- The need to easily fill gaps in their own writing.

Another example of plagiarism, I have seen with groups struggling with writing, is the "sharing" of work; that is, copying and resubmitting assignments to help each other out. "Group" work in this instance is plagiarism as the material is seldom changed and always unattributed.

Of course, all writing is group work in the sense that the student is building upon the works of others. One strategy I employ, to help students acknowledge source material, is to have them consider all papers as group work. In group projects, all student names are included in the final paper. As part of the group, the authors of the reference sources also become group members (i.e., they contribute to the overall success of the assignment). As a result, the authors should be included, through citations and references, for their contribution.

In past discussions regarding instances of plagiarism among ESL students, several professors responded with statements alluding to copying as being part of that student's culture. This is typically a more prevalent response, at least in my experience, if the student is Chinese or South Asian. Such responses, and they are becoming rarer, do two things. First, it creates a stereotype of how students from a certain region act. Second, it somehow trivializes plagiarism by making it something to be expected.

Sowdon (2005) discusses the notion of plagiarism as a virtue. Simply stated, the teacher has the answer, and the student's role is to reproduce this 'correct' answer when responding to the question. The virtue here arises from "producing what you know to be correct" (p. 227). Yes, there are different expectations for writing in different languages. However, having an in-depth familiarity with traditional Chinese culture, I find Sowdon's interpretation to be misleading.

In China, there is a long historical precedent that clearly demonstrates plagiarism was not an

accepted practice. According to Liu (2005) and Wieger (1927), the two words for plagiarism [piāoqiè – 剽窃 and chāoxí – 抄袭] have existed in the Chinese language since at least the Tang dynasty (618-907 AD). The former "means to rob or steal someone else's writing", whereas the latter means "to copy and steal" (Liu, 2005, p. 235).

My own recent conversation with Ms. Law Yuk Ching, a secondary school teacher and disciplinarian, with 35 years of experience within the Hong Kong school system also confirms that plagiarism is not tolerated. There, the offense is punishable by disciplinary action ranging from failing and having to retake an examination to suspension or expulsion from school (C. Law, personal communication, May 20, 2019). It becomes obvious that copying the writing of others and presenting it as your own is not allowed in Hong Kong, China, or Taiwan. Why then would some westerners be confused and think that plagiarism is somehow part of Chinese culture?

As it turns out there are two conditions in Chinese culture, specifically Chinese painting, where exact copying is allowed. The first was the result of a lack of mechanical reproduction technology, such as photography, to exactly copy works of art (Cahill, 1994). In order to share paintings, connoisseurs would have works from their collections accurately copied including, in many examples, signatures and dates as these often formed part of the composition. These copies could then be circulated for examination and comment. While there are a minor number of recorded instances of unscrupulous persons replacing originals with copies, the intent of reproduction was for scholarly discourse only.

There were, however, numerous examples of intentional plagiarism that more closely resembles the example of sharing work between students to meet assignment deadlines. According to Cahill (1994), several Chinese painters, including the famous Tang Yin (1470- 1524), sometimes resorted to "collaboration" to satisfy market demand. In Tang Yin's case, he had his senior do the preliminary brush work – figures that were common and easiest to paint. Tang next took the work over, added his flourishes, dated, signed, and sealed the painting. Instead of presenting the finished product as works "from the studio of…" he sold them, at an inflated price, as his sole original work. This form of plagiarism is now plaguing art historians, auction houses, and collectors as more Chinese works of art come up for sale on the international market.

The second condition where copying and presenting the work as your own occurs when students are learning to paint (Sze, 1959). Here, the student copies the original, often via tracing, and presents it to the teacher as his or her own reproduction. This practice is done to deconstruct works by well-known painters and demonstrate variations in style and technique. Additionally, this process aids in understanding the artist's underlying intent (i.e., the symbolism within the painting). Here, copying is not done to plagiarize. That is, there is no attempt to pretend that a student's reproduction is an original. The intent is clear: plagiarism has a specific goal – to instruct, not to deceive.

Following along this discussion of Chinese painting, it occurred to me that we could look at the process of training painters as a means to train all students, not just ESL students, to become better academic writers. Of course, the following discussion is theoretical and has not been tested

in a classroom setting. This would be the obvious next step for evaluating both the practicality and applicability of my proposed 'model'.

In order to develop this interdisciplinary approach, I first turned to the writings of one of the most famous Chinese painting critics – Hsieh He [or Xiè Hè – 謝赫]. In approximately 550 AD, he proposed Six Principles [繪 畫 六 法, Huìhuà Liùfǎ] or "Six Points when judging a painting" for both analyzing and creating works of art. In order, they are:

1. *Ch'i Yun* or vitality. This refers to the energy in the work that is conveyed from the painter to the viewer.

2. *Ku Fa* or bone method. This refers to creating structure within the work.

3. Ying Wu. This term refers to the depiction of form. Or, as the Chinese say, "according to the object, draw its form".

4. *Sui Lei* refers to the application of color, layering, and the creation of values and tones.

5. *Ching Ying* or division and planning. This term relates directly to the organization and composition of the piece.

6. *Chuan mu*. The passing on of the master's brush (i.e., technique). Simply stated, copy models to learn technique.

What I am proposing is a model of writing analysis that mimics Hsieh Ho's analytical approach to painting to help students better understand and improve their own writing. Because these principles are quite abstract, even for Chinese speakers, the easiest way to begin the process would be to have students engage in a pre-activity that involves comparative analysis of series of similar subjects of one specific painter or artist. If we continue in the Chinese 'vein', we could utilize the paintings by Ni Tsan [Ni Zan – 倪瓚] (1301-1374). One of the most famous painters in Chinese history, during his career he painted only one subject everyday – trees and rocks in an otherwise barren landscape. His compositions were reflections on the state of the empire or on his own life and career. In Western painting, examples could include Claude Monet's series Les Meules à Giverny (The [Hay]stacks at Giverny), David Hockney's Swimming Pools, or Paul Cezanne's Montagne Sainte-Victoire.

To begin, students would be presented with an example of the work for analysis and a list of the six principles. The teacher would explain each of the principles. To avoid stress, students could be randomly divided into small groups and given one principle to respond to. Each group would be asked to write as many short sentences they can to explain what the artist did to meet the requirements of the Principle. Since there are no precedents the students could refer to, they must rely on critical thinking skills to develop their answers. After sharing with the class, a second example is presented and student groups are required to demonstrate how the second art piece fits the criteria of the Principle and then how it compares to the first example.

Next, the instructor presents a modified version of the Six Principles, which I have transposed to

refer to writing.

1. Vitality would consider how the author creates interest and leads the reader through the writing.
2. Bone Method studies the structure of the writing. How does the author outline, order, or manage sources to create a piece that is cohesive and flows?
3. Correspondence to form asks the reader to describe how the reader follows and understands the writing. That is, what is the response to the piece from the point of view of the reader and not the writer.
4. Suitability looks at word choice (color), explores layering in writing (i.e., depth of meaning and understanding). How does the layering help to create more complex meaning? As well, how does it force the reader to seek alternate meaning and understanding?
5. Division and Planning. How is the writing organized? Is there a clearly observable flow and progression? Are there alternate ways of organizing the same elements to create new works or add clarity to the existing work?
6. Copy models. Here the purpose is to study many examples of good writing, especially in your chosen field, to effectively understand and express ideas in your own words.

Principle number 6 is especially valuable to students, as they are most often unaware of three basic precepts of writing.

i. Writing is difficult and good writing is directly connected to good thinking.
ii. Writing is a process. It is not just putting words on paper. Writing should also be viewed as a means to record and sort out your ideas on paper. Good writing is the result of these ideas being synthesized and presented in a way that makes sense to the reader.
iii. Good writing requires the ability to effectively read the source.

Once the instructor has explained the principles, students are then given a piece of writing. Following the previous procedure for analyzing painting, they use the new principles to analyze the written document. The key here is not to write an emotional response to the work (e.g., "This makes me feel …"). The point of the exercise is analytical. We are applying a set of principles, from a discipline that allows copying, to deconstruct written examples and create new works that are not plagiarized. The final phase of these exercises would include the students synthesizing the information from the original piece and expressing it in their own words.

When engaging in this exercise it might be of value to remember the words of another Chinese writer, Lu Chi (1987), who said, *"When studying the works of the Masters, I watch the working of their minds".*

References

Cahill, J. (1994). *The painter's practice.* New York: Columbia University Press.

_____

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: Is cultural conditioning truly the major culprit? *ELT Journal, 59*(3), 234-241. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci043

Lu, C. (1987). *The art of writing* (S. Hill, Trans.). Breitenbush Books (Original work written in 261 A.D.).

Pecorari, D. (2015). Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 94-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.003

Sowdon, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal* 59(3), 226-233. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci042

Sze, M. (1959). *The way of Chinese painting.* New York: Random House.

Wieger, L. (1927). *Chinese characters: Their origin, etymology, history, classification, and signification.* Peking, China: Catholic Mission Press.

Neither Abuse, Nor Neglect:
A Duty-of-Care Perspective on Academic Integrity

Eric Gedajlovic, Simon Fraser University

Martin Wielemaker, University of New Brunswick

Abstract

Approaches and mindsets related to academic integrity are increasingly bifurcating into two polarized camps: one that is characterized by a law-and-order approach and one that prioritizes student experience. The first has been accused of being abusive or insensitive to the stress and anxiety that the approach may cause students, the latter of being neglectful of the need to maintain high standards of academic integrity. This polarization is unhelpful as it hinders thoughtful discussion as well as the formulation of balanced solutions that maintain high standards of academic integrity while also being sensitive to the psycho-emotional needs of students. To address these issues, we propose a duty-of-care perspective, which is based on the principle that as educators, we have a duty-of-care obligation to others and we must therefore act to address academic misconduct, but not without a consideration of the costs and burdens it places on others. Our duty-of-care perspective offers a framework that provides (1) a prosocial motivation and frame of reference for dealing with academic integrity, (2) a guide for developing and assessing alternative courses of action in a balanced and holistic way and, (3) a frame for messaging to stakeholders that we have a duty to act based upon care and shared responsibilities. If we are all in this together, rather than retreating into opposing camps, the duty-of-care perspective unites us around our shared responsibilities.

Neither Abuse, Nor Neglect:
A Duty-of-Care Perspective on Academic Integrity

Across university campuses, academic misconduct has been a long simmering problem for many years (Christensen-Hughes & McCabe, 2006; Gillis, 2015; Edwardson, 2020) and there is considerable evidence suggesting that cheating in college is both widespread and increasing in frequency. In terms of contract cheating alone, a systematic review spanning more than 40 years of research found that rates had increased from a historical average of 3.5% of students to 15.7% for the 2014-2018 period, representing up to 31 million students worldwide (Newton, 2018). In the Canadian context, Eaton (2018) estimates that approximately 71,000 Canadian post-

_____

secondary students have engaged in such cheating behaviour. Despite these alarming figures and trends, Canadian colleges and universities have historically done very little to address the academic integrity problem prosaically described by McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino's (2012) landmark work in "Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it."

Then COVID-19 struck in March 2020, and the resulting move to remote education sent shockwaves across higher education. Among its effects was greater attention and concern raised about high levels of cheating among students (Newton, 2020). At the University of California at Berkeley, academic integrity allegations have risen four-fold during the Fall 2020 semester (Rosenborough, 2020). In Canada, a survey of 500 professors in Quebec this June revealed that 44% had detected cheating in their classes and an additional 32% strongly suspected cheating but believed they did not have sufficient evidence to prove it (Fortier, 2020).

Such reports have put a spotlight on academic misconduct and have compelled university and college teachers and administrators to act. To date, the response to the challenge has largely been ad hoc, fragmented, and uncoordinated across and within schools as individual educators have hastily crafted responses, generally without much institutional guidance and support. The result has been a haphazard hodgepodge of approaches and the measures used to manage and mitigate academic integrity have become a flashpoint for tensions and conflict between and among administrators, instructors and students.

Some instructors and administrators have adopted what we call a "law and order" approach designed to detect and punish cheaters. Some of these responses have been widely criticized as abusive and too heavy handed and insensitive to circumstances being faced by students. For example, at Wilfrid Laurier University students in a linear algebra course were provided with five pages of rules for taking an online midterm (Ghonaim, 2020). This followed a previous incident where some Laurier students were told to purchase an external webcam in a short time frame when many suppliers were out of stock (Hazlewood, 2020). Not surprisingly, this created a huge backlash amongst students and likeminded educators, staff, and administrators who were up in arms, considering these requirements "unreasonable" (para 1). Though we are fierce advocates for greater efforts at managing academic misconduct, we share some of these concerns and see the potential for harm in some law and order styled approaches to addressing the issue.

Others have criticized the response to the problem of academic misconduct at their institutions as inadequate and neglectful. These critics point to unchecked and under-reported incidents of widespread and systemic cheating. We are also sympathetic to this view and believe that many institutions have thus far neglected their responsibilities to various stakeholders by not doing enough to manage and mitigate cheating. As we have argued elsewhere, it is clear that only a tiny percent of cheating is acted upon despite us having the tools to detect it (Gedajlovic, Wielemaker, & McCullough, 2020). That many students continue to engage in flagrant and easily detectable cheating behaviour such as when 30-40 or more students in a single class download an exam

answer from a note sharing site (without any effort to edit or disguise it) suggests that neglect of the problem is still a very serious issue in some schools (Newton, 2020). Such neglect fails to uphold the value of student degrees and the maintenance of a meaningful learning environment among other deleterious effects on students, instructors, alumni, employers and our communities (Gedajlovic, Burke, & Flostrand, 2020).

There are a host of possible reasons for this neglect. Some instructors and administrators believe that they already have too much other work and other more pressing priorities. Some undoubtedly worry about the financial implications of clamping down on misconduct. Others complain about academic misconduct processes that are cumbersome, time consuming and largely ineffective. In many cases, instructors believe they are unsupported and that there are counter incentives for putting effort into ensuring academic integrity; it all seems to come at a cost to their other work and can negatively impact assessments of their performance or even threaten their employment status if it results in lower ratings on student satisfaction surveys, or less research output. Additionally, third parties, such as contract cheating companies and over-involved parents, interfere in the direct relationship with students and therefore also hinder addressing misconduct. And perhaps most importantly, the overprotection of students by some educators (*cf.* Lukianoff & Haidt, 2018) has resulted in some excusing, or even legitimizing, cases of academic misconduct.

In short, some university educators and administrators have been criticized for being too heavy handed and doing too much to curb academic misconduct, whereas others have been criticized for not rising to the challenge and neglecting the problem through inaction. In such an environment, individuals responsible for managing the academic integrity portfolio at our schools might conclude that they will be "damned if they do, and damned if they don't." A natural tendency when confronted with issues such as this is to approach them as a Goldilocks type problem and avoid solutions that are either "too hot" or "too cold." We, however, caution against such an approach as it is likely to result in tepid solutions that are neither effective at curbing cheating nor sensitive to the needs of students and instructors.

So, what are concerned educators and administrators to do? We suggest another approach based upon a different lens or frame of reference that does not manifest itself in terms of abuse or neglect: a duty-of-care perspective. This perspective is based on the idea that as university administrators and instructors, we have a duty-of-care obligation to others and we must therefore act to address academic misconduct, but not without a consideration of the costs and burdens it places on others. Our duty-of-care approach begins with two sets of questions in deciding how and when to act:

1. *In order to mitigate the problem of neglect* - Are we doing what we should to protect our students, educators, schools, alumni, and communities from the very serious adverse effects of academic misconduct?

2. *In order to mitigate the problem of abuse* - Are there things we are doing that we should not? Are our policies and practices insensitive to the circumstances of some individuals and groups and do they place excessive and/or unnecessary burdens on them?

A duty-of-care perspective also helps lay the foundation for the nurturance of a normative environment where people recognize that academic misconduct is a collective problem and that stakeholders have responsibilities and a duty of care to each other. As educators, we have a duty of care towards (a) vulnerable students who might cheat as a result of bad choices and being preyed upon (Gedajlovic, 2020) or blackmailed (Sefcik & Veeran-Colton, 2020) by third parties that wish to profit from them, (b) hardworking students who may be disadvantaged by others cheating, (c) our schools' reputations that may be tarnished as a result of scandals, (d) our alumni who may see the value and legitimacy of their degrees diminished, (e) our communities who trust us to produce competent and ethical graduates, and (f) educators who can lose a sense of purpose if they come to believe that their institutions do not share their values regarding academic standards and integrity. Yet this duty of care simultaneously requires us to consider the circumstances of people and not unduly burden them.

Thus, a duty-of-care perspective requires a balanced approach and a consideration of not only the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action, but also the costs and burdens we place on others through inaction or other forms of neglect. To elaborate, a duty-of-care perspective provides:

(1) A prosocial **M**otivation and frame of reference for dealing with academic misconduct,

(2) A guide for developing and assessing alternative courses of **A**ction in a balanced and holistic way and,

(3) A frame for **M**essaging to stakeholders that we have a duty to act based upon care and shared responsibilities.

Together, the duty-of-care M-A-M elements provide a framework for addressing academic integrity in such a way that avoids abuse and neglect.

While a law and order approach focuses on rules and offences, a duty-of-care perspective focuses on people and their needs. In doing so, it provides us with a strong prosocial motivation for tackling academic integrity. In other words, by adopting a duty-of-care perspective, we are recognizing our responsibility to protect various stakeholders for whom we are responsible from foreseeable harm (De Guttry & Capone, 2018). As the word care implies, we have a duty to do this in a way that is caring and considerate of others.

A duty-of-care perspective also provides direction and guidance on how we are to act. It requires that we consider and weigh alternative means of assessing students' knowledge and skill levels in a way that has rigour and integrity while also considers the need for people to feel respected and

be free of unnecessary stress. The latter requires that people we care for and whom the measures may affect are consulted and listened to. Because we have a duty of care to multiple stakeholders, this means we need to listen to and consider not only the voices of vocal groups and interested parties, but also to students who have different concerns as well as instructors, alumni and employers who are also impacted but whose needs and concerns can be often neglected.

And finally, a duty-of-care perspective also helps with messaging insofar as it allows us to frame academic integrity policies and enforcement as something we do FOR our students and not TO our students. We do it because we care about them, not because we see them as dishonest scofflaws. It is a message that we are in this together and we all have a duty of care to others. Administrators have responsibilities to educators and students. Educators have responsibilities to their schools, colleagues and students. And students have responsibilities as well, especially to their peers.

References

Christensen-Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *36*(2), 1-21.

De Guttry, A., & Capone, F. (2018). Universities duty of care: Legal health, safety and security responsibilities towards their travelling students, faculty, and staff, International SOS Foundation. Retrieved on November 8, 2020 from https://www.internationalsosfoundation.org/-/media/international-sos-foundation/files/resources/international/scholastic/universitylegalresponsibilitysantannaintlsoswhitepaper012018.pdf?la=en

Eaton, S. E. (2018, July 24). Contract cheating: A Canadian perspective. [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2018/07/24/contract-cheating-a-canadian-perspective/

Edwardson, L. (2020). Calgary post-secondaries see rates of academic misconduct, cheating rise during pandemic, CBC News, October 7. Retrieved on November 13, 2020 from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/post-secondary-cheating-misconduct-covid-1.5752971

Fortier, M. (2020). Le confinement a profité aux cégépiens tricheurs. *Le Devoir*, August 24. Retrieved November 11, 2020 from https://www.ledevoir.com/societe/education/584787/education-la-tricherie-a-exploseau-cegep?

Gedajlovic, E. (2020). What is contract cheating? @Teaching Matters Webinar presented on June

22, 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oKHquate2SU

Gedajlovic, E., Burke, K., & Flostrand, A. (2020). Teaching note for contract cheating lands close to home, Ivey Business Case.

Gedajlovic, E., Wielemaker, M., & McCullough, A. (2020, September 9). *Betting on integrity*. Academic Integrity Watch, YouTube channel. Retrieved November 13, 2020 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=niMb2ZyVkmc

Ghonaim, H. (2020, October 30). *Laurier students speak out against 'unnecessary' and 'overcomplicated' exam rules: University says it's looking into student concerns*. CBC News. Retrieved November 8, 2020 from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/laurier-midterms-online-assessment-1.5782156

Gillis, A. (2015, March 23). Academic misconduct 'likely' on the rise in Canada. *University Affairs*. Retrieved November 13, 2020 from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/academic-misconduct-likely-on-the-rise-in-canada/

Hazlewood, J. (2020, May 14). *Laurier math students frustrated over department's decision to require external webcams*. CBC News. Retrieved November 13, 2020 from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/math-students-laurier-webcams-exams-1.5568097

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2018). *The coddling of the American mind: How good intentions and bad ideas are setting up a generation for failure*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Newton, N. (2018). How common is commercial contract cheating in higher education and is it increasing? A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00067

Newton, D. (2020, August 7). *Another problem with shifting education online: cheating; Data show the rate of cheating on tests is on the upswing*. The Hechinger Report. Retrieved November 13, 2020 from https://hechingerreport.org/another-problem-with-shifting-education-online-cheating/

Rosenborough, V. (2020, November 9). UC Berkeley fall 2020 semester sees 400% increase in cheating allegations. *The Daily Californian*. Retrieved November 14, 2020 from https://www.dailycal.org/2020/11/09/uc-berkeley-fall-2020-semester-sees-400-increase-in-cheating-allegations/

_____

Sefcik, L., & Veeran-Colton, T. (2020). Contract cheating and blackmail: A risky business?" *Studies in Higher Education.* https://www-tandfonline-com /doi/pdf/10.1080/03075079.2020.1730313

Acknowledgements