AALL

Association for Academic
Language and Learning

Aligning policy and practice: An approach to integrating academic integrity

Julianne East

Language and Academic Skills (English as a Second Language) Unit, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria 3086, Australia

Email: j.east@latrobe.edu.au

This paper reports on the implementation of academic integrity at an Australian university. This university has a well-written policy detailing values and actions to discourage academic misconduct, but it could align policy and practices for an integrated approach to educating about academic integrity and it could review how alleged instances of plagiarism are handled. This paper describes holistic approaches to academic integrity, and explains how constructive alignment could be used to cultivate a learning environment where there is consistency in dealing with plagiarism. The need to monitor practices and strategies for dealing with academic misconduct is also discussed. For convenience, a checklist of practices supporting an aligned approach to implementing academic integrity has been included. This paper is written for educational developers, student learning advisers, those who have an interest in teaching and learning practices, and those who are concerned about managing risk.

Key Words: academic integrity, academic misconduct, plagiarism, aligned, constructive alignment

1. Introduction

Some universities do it well, some do it badly, and some do not even know they are not doing it. This is the story of one Australian university's approach to implementing academic integrity. Academic misconduct is a concern in all Australian universities, and some now claim they take an "academic integrity" approach and state their support for honesty in academic endeavour. The rhetoric in recent years may have moved from penalising plagiarism to promoting academic integrity, but plagiarism is still seen as something that students do, hence the responsibility for the transgression still lies largely with students. Much of the Australian literature positions plagiarism as a matter of ignorance of rules and guidelines or cheating (Fielden & Joyce, 2008) – students are either ignorant or dishonest. Just as students have been blamed for increases in plagiarism (Robillard & Howard, 2008), so they carry the burden of upholding academic integrity. Unlike the U.K. (see Tennant, Rowell, & Duggan (2007), the AMBeR Project), Australian universities have not been called on to account for increased reports of student plagiarism, nor have they had to demonstrate that they have created contexts conducive to academic integrity. When a university makes public declarations against student plagiarism and academic misconduct, and makes it clear that it is students who should uphold academic integrity, the university is giving a message to students that they are responsible for the transgressions (Howard, 1995, p. 797). This communication is inadequate for sustaining an environment which fosters academic integrity. This paper considers academic integrity to be

more than a matter of student behaviour, and it argues for the problem of plagiarism and cheating to be dealt with as a whole of institution concern, where teaching practices, texts, advice, assessments and penalty process are aligned. Rather than a simple approach of informing students that a policy exists and then penalising, or ignoring those who get it wrong or do not meet expectations, a whole of university approach would be multi-pronged and systematic. Such an approach would not only mean the presence of a policy which details responsibilities, it would also mean taking action to apply policy.

Academic integrity can be understood as promoting an honest community, which has been the emphasis in North America where a moral tone pervades university communications about plagiarism. Exemplifying this is honor codes[1], in which students declare allegiance to the moral standards of their college and can even be the guardians of these standards. While reported as being successful in some North American universities (McCabe & Pavela, 2005), this approach has not been taken up in Australia. For the Australian context, academic integrity could be understood as an approach in which universities not only expect honesty, they also expect and deliver integrity of standards, as in being "true to one's word". Thus a university which demands academic honesty in student work would also be teaching students how to meet its high standards of academic work and demonstrating high standards in dealing with academic misconduct.

This paper briefly reviews the circumstances of student academic misconduct, and focuses on one Australian university to demonstrate the current situation. This university has an academic misconduct policy (Academic Misconduct Policy, 2007[2]) and also has a web page for students defining its academic integrity approach (Academic Integrity and Avoiding Plagiarism, 2008). In addition to approaches taken at some other Australian universities, the paper presents guidelines from the U.K. As part of an aligned approach to integrating academic integrity, the paper recommends that this Australian university align practices, actions and student learning outcomes with its Academic Misconduct Policy. Finally, the paper presents ways to monitor such practices and reflect on their effectiveness. A checklist of practices supporting an aligned approach to implementing academic integrity has been tabled in the appendix.

Underpinning this review is the premise that a well-developed policy is only one part of the process, furthermore, unless a university takes an aligned approach to promoting and supporting academic integrity there will not be consistency in dealing with plagiarism, and without consistency students are likely to be cynical of university practice and fearful of punishment.

2. Context for student academic misconduct

This paper, while aware of staff and researcher plagiarism (Bretag & Carapiet, 2007), limits its focus to student plagiarism and cheating. Staff plagiarism has been less popular as a research topic, although it has attracted attention from the popular press. Perhaps the controversial nature of reporting on colleagues has led to a self censorship within academe. Less controversial is reporting on students' lack of compliance. It is accepted that students are supposed to follow the rules, and because they are low in the university hierarchy, students are vulnerable to reprimand if they break the rules. Staff can be confronted and frustrated by student plagiarism when it is taken as a challenge to the maintenance of university standards (Evans, 2006). On the other hand, writers about plagiarism, such as Buranen and Roy (1999), Howard (2000), and Howard

---

[1] For a bibliography, see Rebecca Moore Howard's (2007) web page. Note that Donald McCabe is frequently cited.

[2] In 2010 the University replaced its Academic Misconduct Policy with an Academic Integrity Policy (2009). The new policy retains much of the wording of the former policy, but has changed its formatting so that sections are now more clearly presented in separate documents. The new policy includes definitions and has separate Guidelines and Procedures documents, but no longer has a flow chart of procedures.

and Robillard (2008), critique the educational contexts where accusations and confusions take place. Howard (2000, p. 475) writes that the term plagiarism is used against students and "supports the worst sort of liberal-culture gatekeeping, maintaining false distinctions between high and low literacy." This critical approach, which challenges university attitudes and practices, contrasts with other literature published at this time which focused on the shame of plagiarism (see McCabe & Drinan, 1999; Hunt, 2002; and the University of Alberta, 2009[3]). In the U.S., the focus on plagiarism as exemplifying unethical behaviour remains productive (Henderson, 2007). Another category of the literature on plagiarism is about educating students and helping students to avoid plagiarism (Carroll, 2002; McGowan, 2005). Building on this concern for student welfare, some writers argue that rather than just educating students, it is also teaching that needs to change (see Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Cadman, 2003; East, 2006).

Student plagiarism and misconduct happens in context. While some research seeks to understand student plagiarism by analysing it as an outcome of student disposition, this paper argues that a focus on plagiarism as a construct of academic culture better supports academic integrity. Robillard (2008, p. 30) argues that: "Devoting pedagogical attention to understanding the reasons students plagiarize is a futile undertaking." Furthermore, despite all the literature on student plagiarism, there is no clear picture of the student plagiarist. No photo kit is available, and no descriptions of likely suspects are available for vigilant teachers on the lookout. Research into who is most likely to cheat or plagiarise shows great variation, with no one type of person standing out as being the most likely (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2003; Park, 2003). We do not know who is likely to plagiarise or cheat, but we do know that it happens. Another problem in determining who has plagiarised is in distinguishing practices. What one person labels transgression, another could ignore or see as unimportant (East, 2005). Park (2004) details some of the confusions around definitions of plagiarism, for example how much copying amounts to plagiarism and whether it was intended.

Typically, definitions of academic integrity use terms such as honesty, respect, and being trustworthy as standards for behaviour. This appeals to universal understandings of morality (Kholberg, 1981). Students who are ignorant or who have not mastered conventions of academic acknowledgment do not have low levels of morality, nor have they breached academic integrity. Universities which are honest, respectful and trustworthy would penalise students who breach academic integrity and support students to learn the conventions of academic integrity.

Given that student characteristics are a poor predictor of academic misconduct, this paper focuses on the environment and considers actions that promote academic integrity. In particular, one university is considered as a case study. This prevents broad generalisations which can sound reasonable from a distance: up close and under scrutiny is when the problems and flaws of practices are revealed.

3. One university as a case study

The university under focus is relatively young, having been established in the second half of last century. It has a vision of delivering "socially responsive and inclusive […] learning, teaching and research" (Our Vision, 2008), but like all Australian universities, it is responsive to market forces and competes for its primary source of funding from enrolments. International student fees are an important source of revenue, and international students make up 16% of the onshore student population of about 24,000. The current management is seeking to enhance reputation and reduce debt through redundancies, and teaching and administration departments are facing review and restructure. In this climate, there are opportunities to review practices, but it is not surprising that some projects are prioritised and some policy responsibilities are not fully

---

[3] For a collection of references about plagiarism as cheating and how to combat student plagiarism, see the University of Alberta (2009).

enacted. At the time of writing there was no person responsible for integrating academic integrity across the University.

The University has a clearly written policy which defines plagiarism, states its values and supports academic integrity. It also gives examples of misconduct, lists staff responsibilities, lists student responsibilities, and specifies activities to ensure these responsibilities are undertaken. In addition, the academic language and learning advisers provide orientation sessions which introduce students to some of the conventions of academic culture, including the need to reference. The advisers have also developed an academic integrity site, housed on the student learning pages, which provides resources for students and staff. The site defines academic integrity and gives examples; its links explain plagiarism and how students can avoid it, what their responsibilities are, and what they can do if accused of plagiarism. The conventions of acknowledgment are explained, and there are activities and referencing models. The University uses the Turnitin® text-matching software, and some lecturers allow students to use Turnitin to check their own work. Currently, Turnitin is managed in the Information and Communications Technology unit which provides technical advice about its use. If plagiarism is determined to have taken place, an account from the findings of the academic misconduct committee is recorded for a central database.

The implementation of the University's policy on academic misconduct could be better integrated. The policy states that the University will train academic staff in how to teach students to use sources and avoid plagiarism, but it does not specify who is to provide this education. This meant that up until 2009[4], from the time the policy was launched in 2007, training was not available. The policy specifies that text-matching software should be used, but in practice no one in the teaching and learning area has been designated to advise staff about how best to use the software for educational purposes. A Turnitin report can reveal chunks of copied text, but an educated decision is required to determine if the text amounts to plagiarism, or ignorance of academic writing conventions (naïve or otherwise), or a legitimate quote with referencing details.

The policy defines lecturer and student responsibilities, but for these to be taken up they need to be aligned with teaching practices. Some lecturers might be aware of their responsibilities, but impetus is needed for staff or students to decide to invest in these responsibilities. The Academic Misconduct Policy provides the worthwhile direction that:

> Students will be advised on effective methods of academic writing, particularly the requirements in quoting, summarising, and paraphrasing the sources they use… This will form part of first-year training of students in how to analyse issues, think critically, synthesise ideas, use sources, and incorporate evidence into their written assignments. (2007, p. 4)

Whether this training takes place and, if it does, whether it is effective should not be assumed.

Reporting processes about cases of academic dishonesty and penalties are clearly specified in the policy, with Faculty Academic Misconduct Committees and the Academic Misconduct Review Committee reporting to the Director, Academic Services, who then reports to the University Academic Committee. Such reporting deals with formally recorded cases of academic misconduct, and ensures that when academic misconduct has been reported through the proper channels it is recorded and dealt with according to the guidelines. It does not deal with whether lecturers have taken on their teaching responsibilities, nor whether these have been effective, nor can it report on cases that have not been formally dealt with.

The current policy calls for all suspected instances of plagiarism to be reported to Heads of Schools, but there is no direction for these Heads to receive training or support in making decisions about plagiarism. Without moderation, these Heads make decisions alone. The

---

[4] In 2009, after the current paper was published, Turnitin was moved to the Teaching and Learning area, and the administrator / developer now delivers training to staff in using this software.

University could not verify if a student in one school would be treated the same way as a student in another school. While the policy does give guidelines for appropriate penalties for misdemeanours, understanding of what constitutes a serious offence varies from person to person (cf. Carroll, 2002). The policy defines plagiarism as copying without "proper acknowledgment", and gives examples which help support the definition (Academic Misconduct Policy, 2007, p. 1). If every case of copying that was not properly acknowledged were brought to the Heads of Schools, they would be inundated.

In discussions with lecturers, this author has become aware that lecturers will deal with suspected cases of plagiarism and academic misconduct rather than report these to Heads of Schools. There are a number of likely reasons for this: lecturers fear loss of autonomy in making decisions about their students' education; lecturers lack confidence in the Head's ability to penalise cheating or to initiate education for poor student practice; and lecturers may not be aware of or be bothered with the sometimes taxing administrative requirements to report. Research from the U.S. confirms that this reaction is not limited to the Australian university under review. In a review of large scale studies of U. S. colleges, McCabe is reported as finding that "faculty members prefer to ignore university academic integrity policy and handle cheating incidents on their own" (McCabe, 2003, as cited in Henderson, 2007, p. 46). The reasons for this include "following appropriate action requires too much time and effort … the penalties determined by the campus judiciary are often inappropriately too harsh or too lenient …" (p. 46). Henderson found that some lecturers use a student's plagiarism as an opportunity to teach the conventions of acknowledgment, which she labels "the teachable moment" (p. 130). Whether or not disregard of policy is well-intentioned, if there is a mismatch between policy and practice, a university is vulnerable to accusations of inconsistency, unfair treatment of students and ignorance.

No doubt, all universities have practices which could be improved on. How many universities could give positive ticks and answer "when" and "how" to the checks in the simple "Checklist for an aligned approach to implementing academic integrity" in the appendix? The next section discusses models and guidelines for implementing academic integrity, with a particular focus on holistic approaches.

4. Approaches to implementing academic integrity

Understanding how to avoid plagiarism is not just a student problem, staff also need support and education to teach students. Some lecturers may not have experienced the explicit teaching of acknowledgment skills when they were students, some may not have learnt how to teach such academic skills in their professional education, and some, having become acculturated into academic culture and their discipline (East, 2006), may not be conscious of all the skills that students need to master in order to successfully construct an academic text. Strategies to redress this could include face-to-face and online workshops. Registration in these could be tied to professional development to ensure that staff take advantage of such workshops. Also useful would be models and teaching examples which can be adapted, and guides which are available when staff need them (see Twomey, White, & Sagendorf, 2009). Presenting information in an appealing way is strategic. At Swinburne University, workshops to explain the university's approach to dealing with plagiarism were knowingly titled "Quick Fix" workshops (Devlin, 2006, p. 51).

From a learning perspective, the development of citation skills takes time and practice and requires explanation, guidance and modelling. Formative assessment can be a means for students to learn how to avoid plagiarism, attribute sources and use quotations to provide evidence. While explanations about the problem of plagiarism and models of good practice can be accessed on websites and through class activities, without the impetus of assessment, students would be unlikely to use these sources. In fact, for most people, the need to acknowledge sources only happens when they make texts for assessment because this is when they have an audience. Students are alert to assessment, and feedback from assessment is a

powerful teaching strategy (Biggs & Tang, 2007, p. 97). Tasks set early in a course can be diagnostic – revealing what students do not know and need to learn – and are an opportunity for feedback which students can actually respond to.

The University of Adelaide's educational development for staff and students highlights the role of evidence-based research in academic writing so that students understand the purpose of using references rather than focussing on avoiding plagiarism (McGowan, 2007, 2008). This sends a message that the University promotes learning rather than punishing its students. Bertram Gallant (2007, p. 108) in her review of the literature suggests that an educational approach has more impact on students than do statements about cheating (see also Twomey et al., 2009). Nevertheless, a survey of University of Adelaide staff about use of Turnitin revealed that staff wanted more training in its use, and that existing resources about avoiding plagiarism needed to be better promoted (Crisp, 2007).

Some Australian universities in implementing academic integrity have taken a comprehensive approach, which involves education, detection, and explicit designation of responsibility and accountability. These universities have an office assigned to deal with issues of academic integrity, and they not only allocate time for academic staff to deal with suspected instances of academic misconduct, they also provide staff development and support for staff who have taken on the role of academic integrity officers. The University of Newcastle, in reaction to a public outing of poor handling of student plagiarism, investigated ways to avoid further instances of academic misconduct and became a leader in setting standards for academic integrity. The University of Newcastle (2008) has comprehensive resources and staff development, a central register for student breaches of academic conduct, and a group of Student Academic Conduct Officers (appointed by Heads of Schools). Similarly, as part of its academic integrity approach, the University of South Australia (2008) has Academic Integrity Officers. They have a central coordinator and a comprehensive program of moderation, support and a discussion forum.

Macdonald and Carroll (2007, p. 235) argue that universities and those discussing the problems of plagiarism have not always recognised that "plagiarism is a complex problem", and to counter simple fixes, they propose a "holistic" approach. Proceedings from the Australia Pacific Conferences on Educational Integrity (APFEI, 2008) indicate that there is much discussion about the complexities of plagiarism. This is not to say that the way universities have dealt with the issues of plagiarism has always demonstrated recognition of the complexities. In general, universities in Australia have been slow to deal with the problems of plagiarism in a concerted and holistic way. In 2003, Devlin reviewed the holistic approach, and in 2006 she was still writing about the potential for its take up.

Devlin (2006, p. 49) describes the holistic approach promoted at Swinburne University as including a clear policy, consistent processes for dealing with suspected plagiarism, student guides (hard copy and e-copy), descriptions of plagiarism which are assignment specific, a focus on assessment, a transition program, "proactive and strategic use of available student support services" and a central register. Macdonald and Carroll (2007) would argue that even more is needed for a university to stake claim to a holistic approach (see below). A change management consultant advised Swinburne University "… not to 'cherry pick'" and that:

> … an integrated, strategic approach that recognises and counters plagiarism at every level from university policy, through student preparation through the provision of education and resources and ongoing student support, staff education of students and assessment design, to the uniform application of appropriate processes and consequences was recommended. It was emphasised that this was not to say that all changes had to be made simultaneously, but that they must all be made. (Devlin 2006, p. 52)

Macdonald and Carroll (2007, pp. 241-243) point out that a holistic approach ensures that staff as well as students get the message about academic integrity. They argue for a proactive analysis and tracking of procedures as follows:

Documenting evidence of teaching about academic integrity and conventions
1. Recording when and how students are informed of regulations and responsibilities
2. Recording the ways in which the university promotes academic integrity
3. Ongoing staff development
4. Preventing individual decision making – which leads to inconsistency and unfairness
5. Systematic collection of data on plagiarism and how it is treated
6. Checking for under reporting

Finally, like Devlin they argue for "assessment-led solutions" (p. 243) in which formative assessments are used to teach students how and why to avoid plagiarism.

In the United Kingdom, much work has been done on developing models and guidelines for implementing academic integrity and dealing with plagiarism. Jude Carroll, at Oxford Brookes University, by demonstrating inconsistencies in decision making about plagiarism, provided evidence for the need to have an efficient system for education and supporting staff who make decisions about plagiarism (Carroll, 2002; Carroll & Appleton, 2005). Her model of a network of Academic Misconduct Officers was taken up in Australia by the University of Newcastle and the University of South Australia (see above). Park (2004) described the framework at Lancaster University which has "core pillars" of "transparency, ownership, responsibility, academic integrity, compatibility with the institution's academic culture, focus on prevention and deterrence and support for and development of students' skills" (p. 291). These pillars would underpin an academic integrity approach, but without a constructive alignment approach to teaching and learning, and without monitoring, there would be no way of knowing if academic integrity was really being implemented. With a hierarchy of approaches and penetrating questions, the "Plagiarism Road Map", developed in 2005 by the U.K. based Plagiarism Advisory Service, offers a structured way for universities to gauge where their practices fit on the road to a holistic approach to plagiarism prevention and detection. A university at the lowest level would not have policies or documents to deal with plagiarism; beyond this, universities could recognise the need to have such policies but might not have ways to actually implement policy and then evaluate its effectiveness. At more holistic levels, universities will have embedded ways of dealing with plagiarism in their teaching and learning practices, and then universities would evaluate and review policies and practices. The descriptions of these levels limit the focus to that of plagiarism rather than encompassing broader issues of academic integrity, however, the "Plagiarism Road Map" also provides reflection questions intended to provoke discussions conducive to action.

The rest of this paper discusses how academic integrity can be implemented through constructive alignment which focuses on teaching and learning practices, and how such practices can be reflected on and monitored.

5. A constructive alignment approach to teaching and learning

The constructive element in the constructive alignment approach refers to a theory of learning which puts the learner as central to the creating of meaning. Biggs (1996, p. 348) explains that, "learners arrive at meaning by actively selecting and cumulatively constructing, their own knowledge, through individual and social activity." The alignment element refers to a teaching and learning environment in which activities, assessments and institutional practices are essentially linked or aligned with performances and objectives or outcomes (Biggs, 1996; 2002; Biggs & Tang, 2007). At the subject level this is manifest in student learning outcomes, where assessment matches what is taught and what students are expected to do; at the course level this is demonstrated in graduate attributes or capabilities; and at the institutional level the policies, environment and procedures support the student experience. A university that claims to support students but does not enact its enabling policies, or delivers poor teaching in overcrowded lecture theatres or does not enable students to meet graduate capabilities does not have integrity. Academic integrity is integral to constructive alignment because it underpins the reliability of

learning outcomes and graduate capabilities. Implementing academic integrity reduces opportunities for graduation to be awarded to students who have not constructed their own knowledge, instead claiming others' work as their own.

In a constructively aligned course there is a match between what lecturers want to teach and what the students learn, which can be assessed as outcomes. To develop student learning outcomes, Biggs and Tang (2007) ask readers to consider:

- What do you expect students to know /be able to do?
- What do you want them to learn?
- What is the best way to get them to learn it?
- How can you tell if they have learnt it?

Learning outcomes can also be used to distinguish cheating from lack of mastery of the conventions of academic citation. Another question to consider when assessing individual work is: "How can you tell if this student did the work of constructing this assignment?" Aligning what is taught with what is assessed can demonstrate what students have learnt and that they have not cheated for a particular task.

In a course which is successfully aligned, the students and their teachers perceive there is value in learning what is being taught. The university under focus provides online resources and voluntary skills workshops which students can access *if* they perceive the need. Communication that these resources exist is vital, so that staff and students are aware of the resources about academic integrity and acknowledgment. Initially, however, students may not be motivated to take advantage of these; they can be unaware that their acknowledgment skills differ from what is expected at university (Emerson, 2008). Students can also be over-informed about the need to avoid plagiarism (Robillard, 2008) and so lose interest in finding out how to acknowledge properly. Biggs and Tang (2007, p. 32) argue that one of the factors that lead students to want to learn at university is that "[i]t has to be important; it must have some *value* to the learner." To many students, skills workshops and online resources are an extra which take up their limited time, even though these services could be seen as value-adding for a university. In the current university's case, if practice were aligned with policy, teaching these skills would not be just an extra, because the policy states that all first year courses are supposed to inform students about the University's position on academic misconduct and how to reference appropriately. Currently, at this university only one Faculty perceives academic integrity to be valuable enough to be a curriculum component in a first year mandatory subject.

Talking to students about why acknowledgment and avoiding plagiarism are important is not the same as teaching students how to acknowledge properly. Nor is providing resources, such as style guides and exemplars the same as teaching students how to reference and use research-based evidence. Student academic writers require direction, practice and feedback, and their teachers need to be aware of what they expect, so that they can direct students to these expectations. A successful outcome from a class teaching the conventions of acknowledgment would be that students are able to cite to meet graded criteria. These criteria could range from one annotated text correctly referenced, up to a sophisticated text in which arguments are supported with a weaving of multiple references (Thompson, 2005). Not just left to chance: the components of teaching methods, assessment tasks and outcomes would be aligned. As Biggs (2002, p. 2) said, "The learner is 'trapped', and cannot escape without learning what is intended". What is intended is made explicit in an outcomes based statement. More than a goal, Biggs and Tang (2007, p. 7) argue that it "tells us what, and how well, students are able to do something that they were unable, or only partially able, to do before teaching."

Without documented evidence of teaching about academic integrity and conventions, and without the recording of when and how students are informed of regulations and responsibilities (see Macdonald and Carroll (2006) above) the learning of the skills of referencing and textual synthesising of quotations cannot be assumed to have taken place. Students come to university with their own construction of knowledge and learning. Students might also have a different

understanding of how to use evidence. Undergraduates are unfamiliar with academic conventions, but postgraduates can also be unaccustomed to or will not have mastered the conventions. Entry points for new students can be at all levels, which means lecturers will need to find out through questioning and formative tasks what students do not know. Informed by this, lecturers can confidently set up outcomes based statements which are relevant to the students' existing knowledge base, thus making it possible for all students to be able to successfully complete the set tasks. If, for example, students are to receive marks for how well they had discussed the literature, they would need to be able to select, reference and synthesise sources. Students are penalised if assessments assume competency in skills areas which have not been taught (Bertram Gallant, 2008, pp. 90-91).

To implement academic integrity, alignment between policy, course development, teaching, learning and assessment is vital. Just as Biggs claims that outcomes based learning means the learner cannot escape without learning, so a lecturer would not be able to escape his or her responsibilities as stated in policy, because implementing these would be integral to the process of constructing a subject and its assessments, which would be linked to the graduate capabilities of the course and the university. A further important step is reviewing these practices by monitoring and reflecting on their impact.

6. Monitoring and reflecting

Bertram Gallant (2008) argues that academic integrity is linked with institutional integrity. It is not just a problem of student behaviour, it is about the processes of the university and how students and staff are treated and treat each other. Institutional integrity also can be seen to occur when a university can provide evidence that its practices and actions support its policy in more than sporadic and anecdotal ways (MacDonald & Carroll, 2006, p. 242).

Do students know what is expected of them? Are staff aware of their responsibilities? A policy might list student responsibilities, and a link to the policy can sit in a subject outline but this does not mean that students have been informed. Registering that students have actually been informed is a check which has the potential to make transparent the practices which are effective. At a minimum, a check list in which staff tick when and how they have directed students to their responsibilities, and have taught certain acknowledgment conventions ensures some teaching coverage has taken place. From this point of view, reflection provokes analysis of how to be effective, and a survey could be a way to reveal what students still need to learn.

Where is academic misconduct taking place? Why is this so? What can be done about academic misconduct from a teaching and learning perspective? Data collection of academic misconduct cases that have been formally dealt with will indicate some trends, including where most of the misconduct takes place and in which subjects. What these data do not reveal is why this takes place. Bertram Gallant (2008, p. 109) suggests "red flags" for instances of academic misconduct occurring in situations which indicate "corruption of teaching and learning". These include large classes, increased numbers of students without increased support, large undergraduate classes with over reliance on undergraduate teaching assistants, and under reporting of academic misconduct. For universities without staff in the teaching and learning area assigned to take on academic integrity, there is no qualitative research asking about the relationship between academic misconduct and teaching.

Are staff making decisions alone? Is decision making consistent? Carroll and Appleton (2001, p. 32) argue that "having a small number of staff in each subject area, who are properly trained and who will work as a team across the institution" reduces under reporting of academic misconduct and "fast-tracks" procedures. Staff making decisions about student academic misconduct are not working in isolation and are connected in a discussion group so they can moderate and monitor their decisions on a regular basis. Such practices build awareness across the university and support consistency. Another way to promote consistency of decision making is to collect and map data from decision makers and lecturers about how they react to suspected

cases of academic misconduct. Feedback of any inconsistencies supports a call for ways to develop consistent decision making.

Are resources available for staff and students appropriate and effective? Earlier it was reported that the university under focus has a number of resources available for staff and students. What is not known is how useful these are. It is not known whether anyone actually uses these materials, or if they do, how effective they are for teaching and learning about academic integrity and the problem of plagiarism. A review with focus groups could evaluate the effectiveness of these resources, and incorporating interaction and discussion on the web site would provide the possibility for ongoing monitoring and feedback.

The aim of monitoring is to ultimately promote effective practice and to take action on practices that are not working. This is a process which does not happen by chance. It involves analysing the data on academic misconduct cases, reviewing and reflecting on practices of teaching academic convention and promoting academic integrity. The aim is not just to improve student behaviour, it is also to support good teaching practice and where needed improve student treatment so that all students, no matter what course they are doing, will receive the same opportunities to learn about the University's standards of academic integrity. In addition, students will receive judgments on academic misconduct which can be defended as fair, just and compassionate. Furthermore, the University would demonstrate integrity in all the ways it deals with academic misconduct. Without monitoring, reflection, and feedback to support change, there will be confusion and fear for students.

7. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed how one Australian university is handling student plagiarism and academic misconduct. The University is on the path to an integrated approach to academic integrity with a clearly written policy, but without designates responsible for ensuring that the policy is implemented as part of teaching and learning, its implementation cannot be assumed.

The paper argues that awareness of what is entailed in academic integrity needs to be built into the curriculum, and this needs to be documented. The impact of this teaching needs to be measured and student awareness needs to be assessed, so that teachers can reflect on what more students need to learn. In order to align student learning outcomes in the curriculum with the University's policy, teachers at the university under focus will need to be clear about what students need to know, when and how they will be taught this and when and how this learning will be demonstrated.

The University's policy directs that all suspected cases of plagiarism be sent to the Head of School. Currently, these staff dealing with student plagiarism and academic misconduct are not supported through training and moderation, and they make decisions alone. Furthermore, the direction to send all suspected cases of plagiarism to the Head of School has created an environment conducive to under reporting of plagiarism. Research enquiring into lecturers' practices when confronted with student plagiarism could underpin changes in practice and policy to ensure that student plagiarism is appropriately dealt with.

This paper recommends some of the practices at other Australian universities, and models and frameworks from the U.K., but does not assume that the policies, teaching practices, assessments and ways of dealing with academic misconduct at other universities are aligned. Close scrutiny could well reveal that, with regard to academic integrity, many Australian universities are vulnerable to accusations of misalignment in policies, practices and processes. In the interests of student equity, investigation into the ways that Australian universities deal with plagiarism is an important topic for further research. Such research could also compare

Australian universities to reveal whether they are consistent with each other in the ways that they deal with plagiarism[5].

Finally this paper rests its case to implement academic integrity through constructive alignment on the premise that universities value education. Through education, we can promote values, change understandings, change behaviour and stop certain behaviours. A university which does not align policy, teaching practices, and processes for implementing academic integrity and dealing with plagiarism sends a message to students that academic integrity is an imposition. When universities take academic integrity seriously they do not burden students, they treat them with respect.

Appendix A. Checklist for an aligned approach to implementing academic integrity

Who takes responsibility for ensuring that the implementation of academic integrity is aligned with policy, teaching and learning practices, decision making, and review of programs?

University policy	Yes	No
Does the university state its support for academic integrity?		
Does the policy define key terms and detail processes and penalties?		
Does the policy detail reasonable responsibilities for staff?		
Does the policy detail reasonable responsibilities for students?		

Teaching and learning practices	When?	How?
Staff are informed about their responsibilities.		
Staff development is provided.		
Students are informed about their responsibilities.		
Lecturers are aware of what students need to learn.		
Students are taught the conventions of acknowledgment and using evidence.		
Students demonstrate that they can use research based evidence.		

Decision-making	Yes	No
Can the university guarantee that a student misdemeanour in one subject will be treated in the same way as would the same sort of misdemeanour in any other subject?		
Does decision-making about misdemeanours comply with the policy?		
Is support provided for the officers making decisions about academic misconduct?		

Review	When?	How?
Are resources analysed for effectiveness?		
Is the promotion of academic integrity monitored?		
Are data about transgressions analysed and acted upon?		

[5] See research from the U.K. (Tennant, Rowell & Duggan, 2007)

References

Academic Integrity and Avoiding Plagiarism (2008). La Trobe University. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/learning/integrity.html.

Academic Integrity Policy (2009). La Trobe University. Retrieved September 9, 2010, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/policy/all-policies

Academic Misconduct Policy (2007). La Trobe University. Retrieved May 20, 2009, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/policy/all-policies.

APFEI (2008). Australia Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity. Retrieved December 18, 2008, from http://apfei.edu.au/tiki-index.php

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Bertram Gallant, T. (2008). *Academic integrity in the twenty-first century: A teaching and learning imperative*. ASHE Higher Education Report, *33*(5). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Biggs, J. (2002). Aligning the curriculum to promote good learning. *Constructive Alignment in Action: Imaginative Curriculum Symposium*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from http://www.palatine.ac.uk/files/1023.pdf

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 367-364.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. 3rd Edition, Berkshire: Society for Research into Higher Education, Open University Press.

Bretag, T., & Carapiet, S. (2007). Self-plagiarism in Australian academic research: Identifying a gap in codes of ethical conduct. In T. Bretag (Ed.). *Proceedings of the 3rd Asia-Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity: Creating a Culture of Integrity*, 7-8 December 2007, Adelaide: University of South Australia. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.unisa.edu.au/educationalintegrity/conference/proceedings.asp

Buranen, L., & Roy, A. (Eds.) (1999). *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Cadman, K. (2003). 'Divine discourse': Plagiarism, hybridity and epistemological racism. In S. May, M. Franken & R. Barnard (Eds.). *Proceedings of the LED Inaugural International Conference on Language, Education & Diversity*, 26-29 November 2003, Hamilton, New Zealand, The University of Waikato. CD

Carroll, J. (2002). *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University.

Carroll, J., & Appleton, J. (2005). Towards consistent penalty decisions for breaches of academic regulations in one UK university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/15/5

Carroll, J., & Appleton, J. (2001). *Plagiarism: A good practice guide*. Oxford Brookes University. Retrieved May 20, 2009, from http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/brookes.pdf

Crisp, G. (2007). Staff attitudes to dealing with plagiarism issues: Perspectives from one Australian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *3*(1), 3-5. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/

Devlin, M. (2003). 'Policy, preparation, prevention and punishment: One Faculty's wholistic approach to minimising plagiarism.' In M. Marsden & M. Hicks (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference: Plagiarism and Other Perplexities*, 21-22 November 2003, Adelaide, Australia, University of South Australia.

Devlin, M. (2006). Policy, preparation, and prevention: Proactive minimization of student plagiarism. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *28*(1), 45-58.

East, J. (2005). Proper acknowledgment? *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, Academic Integrity Issue*, *2*(3a), 1-11.

East, J. (2006). The problem of plagiarism in academic culture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *2*(2), 113-125. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/

Emerson, L. (2008). Plagiarism, a Turnitin trial, and an experience of cultural disorientation. In C. Eisner, and M. Vicinus (Eds.) *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age*. University of Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Evans, R. (2006). Evaluating an electronic plagiarism detection service. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 7*(1), 87 – 89. Retrieved from http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/conference2006/documents/papers/2006papers01.pdf

Fielden, K., & Joyce, D. (2008). An analysis of published research on academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *4*(2), 4-24. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/

Henderson, E. (2007). *Faculty perceptions of and responses to academic dishonesty: An analysis from an ethical perspective*. A Doctoral Dissertation. Temple University.

Howard, R. M. (2000). Sexuality, textuality: The cultural work of plagiarism. *College English*, *62*(4), 473-491. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/view/00100994/ap020471/02a00020/

Howard, R. M. (2007). Honor codes: A bibliography for composition and rhetoric. The Writing Program, Syracuse University. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://wrt-howard.syr.edu/Bibs/HonorCodes.htm

Howard, R. M., & Robillard, A. E. (Eds.) (2008). *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Hunt, R. (2002). *Four reasons to be happy about internet plagiarism*. St. Thomas University. Retrieved August 1, 2005, from http://www.stu.ca/~hunt/4reasons.htm

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Barton, S. (2003). Collegiate academic dishonesty revisited: What have they done, how often have they done it, who does it, and why did they do it? *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, *7*(4), 1-27. Retrieved from http://www.sociology.org/

McCabe, D., & Drinan, P. (1999). Toward a culture of academic integrity. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* Oct 15, B7.

McCabe, D., & Pavela. G. (2005). New Honor Codes for a New Generation. *Inside Higher Education,* Mar 11. Retrieved May 20, 2009, from http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2005/03/11/pavela1

Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism – a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), April 2006, 233-245. http://www.liu.se/content/1/c6/01/80/56/Jude%20Caroll.pdf

McGowan, U. (2005). Plagiarism detection and prevention: Are we putting the cart before the horse? In A. Brew & C. Asmar (Eds). *Higher education in a changing world, Proceedings of the 28th HERDSA Annual Conference*, Sydney, 3-6 July 2005: 28, 287-293. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/herdsa2005/pdf/refereed/paper_412.pdf

McGowan, U. (2007). Research – Writing: Learning a writing skill and thereby avoiding plagiarism.© The University of Adelaide. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.adelaide.edu.au/clpd/

McGowan, U. (2008). International students: A conceptual framework for dealing with unintentional plagiarism. In T. Roberts (Ed.). *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions*. New York: Information Science Reference, Hershey.

Our Vision (2008). About La Trobe. La Trobe University. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/about.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: plagiarism by university students – literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *28*(5) 471-488.

Park, C. (2004). Rebels without a clause: Towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *28*(3) 291-306.

Plagiarism Road Map (2005). Plagiarism Advisory Service, Northumbria Learning Ltd. *JISC*. Retrieved April 2, 2009 from http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/roadmapmethod.php

Robillard, A. (2008). Situating plagiarism as a form of authorship: The politics of writing in a first year writing course. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard, (Eds.) *Pluralizing Plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Tennant P., Rowell, G., & Duggan, F. (2007). AMBeR Project. *JISC*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from www.jiscpas.ac.uk

Thompson, C. (2005). 'Authority is everything': A study of the politics of textual ownership and knowledge in the formation of student writer identities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/

Twomey, T., White, H., & Sagendorf, K. (Eds.) (2009). *Pedagogy not policing: Positive approaches to academic integrity at the university*. New York: Syracuse.

University of Alberta Libraries References. Retrieved June 23, 2009, from http://www.library.ualberta.ca/guides/plagiarism/references/

University of Newcastle Academic Integrity – for staff (2008). Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.newcastle.edu.au/service/academic-integrity/staff/saco-staff.html

University of South Australia (2008). Academic Integrity. Retrieved November 25, 2008, from http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/academicintegrity/AIOs/overview.asp