

Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
March 14, 2011

APPROVED

PRESENT: Bruce Bishop, Melinda Carrillo, Haydn Davis, Katy French, Lori Graham, Erin Hartensveld, Barb Kelber, Teresa Laughlin, Pam McDonough, Linda Morrow, Wendy Nelson, Patrick O'Brien, Perry Snyder, Fari Towfiq,

ABSENT: Monika Brannick, Jackie Martin-Klement, Diane Studinka

GUESTS: Marlita Donan (ASG), Martin Japtok, Greg Larson

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the Vice President, Fari Towfiq, at 2:00 p.m., in Room SU-30.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion 1 MSC Bishop, Hartensveld: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of March 7, 2011, as amended. The motion carried.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Announcements: There were no announcements.

Committee
Appointments: There were no committee appointments.

Elections: Patrick O'Brien announced that a call to fill upcoming Faculty Senate vacancies will be distributed this week. Two Faculty Council positions, one full-time position through 2012, five full-time positions through 2014, and one part-time position through 2014, will be filled. All nominations will be placed on a ballot, with the exception of nominations of members of the Math department. Currently, two Math department faculty serve on the Senate; the Faculty Constitution, in the interest of diverse representation, requires that "no more than two tenured or probationary faculty members shall be elected from a single department of the faculty."

Barb Kelber added that given the District's plan to hire 18 new faculty members in the fall semester, her duties as Tenure & Evaluations Review Coordinator will not allow sufficient time for her to continue to serve as Faculty Senate Secretary. She asked Senators to consider serving in the position.

Curriculum: The next meeting of the Curriculum Committee will be held on March 16, 2011.

Policies & Procedures: No Policies & Procedures were brought forward for review this week.

GRAD Program: There was no report.

SB1440 Update: There was no report.

Accrediting Commission
for Community and
Junior Colleges: Handouts were provided from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), (Exhibits A, B, & C). Fari Towfiq asked Senators to review the

documents, as they are currently going through the initial review stages at ACCJC. The Commission invites review and feedback. More information will be forthcoming as the process moves forward.

Academic Technology
Committee:

Haydn Davis reported that members of the Academic Technology Committee are currently discussing the development of training modules for those faculty members who will be teaching online courses. The committee will provide approximately three full days of training sessions after the end of the semester.

Governing Board:

Fari Towfiq reported that the Governing Board approved two newly developed transfer degrees at its March 8 meeting. The degrees were developed by faculty in Sociology, and Psychology.

Faculty Service Area
Committee:

Lori Graham reported that the Faculty Service Area Committee will meet on Tuesday, March 29, at 2:00 p.m. in AA 109. Representation is still needed from Administration, the Career & Technical Education division, and the Palomar Faculty Federation.

ASG:

Marlita Donan reported that members of the ASG finalized next year's proposed budget at their last meeting. Angel Jimenez was elected as the new chairperson for the Elections Committee.

Palomar Faculty
Federation:

Perry Snyder reported that members of the Palomar Faculty Federation met last week. There were no new items to report.

Learning Outcomes
Council:

Katy French stated that the Learning Outcomes Council will hold its next meeting on Thursday, March 31. She reminded all Senators of the LOC's goals regarding SLO and assessment reports to be entered into the Palomar Outcomes Database (POD) by the end of the current semester. French emphasized the importance of these goals in light of the accreditation standards and the requirement of an updated report to be submitted to the ACCJC in June.

As of February 15, 2011, there was a completion rate of 39% of courses with at least one SLO/assessment plan in the POD. As of March 12, 2011, that number has improved to 43%, but the goal remains 100% by the end of the semester.

The program-related goal is to have at least 50% of Programs addressed in the POD by the end of the semester. The Programs should indicate at least one SLO with assessment plans.

French reminded Senators that faculty mentors are available to assist with entering SLOAC data into the Outcomes Database, developing course and program SLOs, and planning for assessment of SLOs. They can also answer questions regarding Palomar SLOAC policies and procedures. Contact information is posted on the Learning Outcomes website.

Joint Senate/PFF
Council:

Barb Kelber reported that members of the Joint Senate/PFF Council will meet on Tuesday, March 15. The group is currently discussing the Recruitment and Hiring Policy.

SPC/Budget
Committee:

Fari Towfiq stated that detailed information about Palomar's budget will be provided at the All College Forum scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, at 2:00 p.m. in the Governing Board room.

A tuition increase to \$36 per unit will take effect in the Fall, 2011 semester.

Instructional

Planning Council:

Linda Morrow reported that the IPC has released notifications of funding decisions for last year's PRP's. The group continues their work for this year and hopes to complete the process in a timely manner.

President Deegan:

Fari Towfiq indicated that she and Monika Brannick will meet with President Deegan after spring break for their bi-monthly meeting.

Human Resources

Planning Council:

The Human Resources Planning Council will meet on Tuesday, March 15.

Other:

Fari Towfiq reminded all of the Diversity Event scheduled for Thursday, April 7, at 5:00 p.m. in the Student Union area. Fliers will be distributed soon with more information about the event.

TERB: 50/50 Joint

Appointment for

Lateral Transfer:

Fari Towfiq informed Senate members of two faculty members in the English Department who are interested in splitting a full-time lateral transfer to the Multicultural Studies department. These faculty members will be serving 50% of their contract in the English department and 50% in the Multicultural Studies department. The proposal has been approved by the Equivalency Committee, and support has been expressed by the Multicultural Studies department, the English department, the deans of the affected divisions, and the Vice President for Instruction.

Towfiq referred to the following contract language for the purpose of the discussion:

20.2 Transfer

A "transfer" for purposes of this Article is a movement of a tenured (regular) and/or probationary (contract) faculty member from one department to another department within the District. A lateral transfer may include a full or partial load.

20.2.1

Voluntary Transfer

District/PFF Agreement Board Ratified 5/12/10

20.2.1.1

At any time, a tenured (regular) and/or probationary (contract) faculty member may request in writing a voluntary reassignment to a vacant or new position. The request shall be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Human Resource Services. The District will consider any such written request as long as the faculty member meets the minimum requirements for the vacant or new position sought, possesses the Faculty Service Area (FSA) for the vacant or new position sought, and has not received a *Substandard Performance* or *Unsatisfactory* evaluation within the last five (5) years. A vacant or new position will normally be advertised no less than ten (10) calendar days, except that the District reserves the right to make interim appointments at any time, and also the right to make regular appointments more quickly in unusual circumstances.

20.2.1.2

The following individuals and groups must approve a voluntary transfer: the affected Vice President(s), the affected Dean(s) or first-level educational administrator(s) in charge of the departments, the affected Department Chairs, and a majority of the faculty in the department into which the faculty member wishes to transfer.

Towfiq added that because there is no specific language in the contract to describe a 50/50 shared position after the shared lateral transfer is approved, the details must be addressed to ensure that faculty members and departments are protected.

Towfiq announced that a workgroup has been created to discuss these issues. The group will meet on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 12:30 p.m. in SU-30, and all are invited to attend. Members include Senate President Monika Brannick, Senate Vice President Fari Towfiq, an advisory member of the Palomar Faculty Federation, Martin Japtok, Rafiki Jenkins, and department chairs of the English and Multicultural Studies departments. The group will discuss not only this particular situation, but will attempt to identify the issues that may arise after any 50/50 shared lateral transfer is approved.

Teresa Laughlin noted that specific details for a 50/50 shared position, particularly with regard to Reduction in Force and bumping rights, should be written into the contract. This language would be intended to ensure protections for the faculty members as well as the District in the unlikely event of a Reduction in Force (RIF). Martin Japtok pointed out that he believes the rules relating to seniority are already clearly indicated in the contract, and he and Rafiki Jenkins would therefore have bumping rights over any affected junior faculty members.

Pam McDonough offered a point of clarification based on the minutes of the English Department meeting, noting that the English Department supported the arrangement, but approval was given with the qualification that the Faculty Senate, the PFF, and TERB would be involved in establishing contract language and details for the creation of a new type of faculty position.

Several Senators expressed enthusiasm and support for the idea of the shared position, noting the potential for cross-disciplinary engagement and the benefits for Multicultural Studies.

This issue will remain on the agenda for ongoing discussion.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Neault Kelber, Secretary

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education

(Adopted June 2001, Edited August 2004, Revised June 2005, Revised January 2010, *First Reading January 2011*)

Background

Recognizing that most institutions ~~must make~~ *are making* use of the growing range of ~~systems~~ *modalities* for delivery of instructional ~~and educational programs and services~~, including various electronic means, the Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) has adopted a policy based on principles of good practice to help ensure that distance learning is characterized by the same ~~concerns~~ *expectations* for quality, integrity, and effectiveness that apply to more traditional modes of instruction.

This policy reflects the federal regulatory requirements regarding distance education and correspondence education.

~~As methods used to facilitate/conduct distance learning evolve, the ACCJC policies that address distance learning also change. This policy statement has drawn from several previous policies and is intended to replace those policies with a single, unified, and up-to-date statement. Further development of this policy may well be appropriate in the not-so-distant future.~~

Definition of Distance Education

~~“Distance education is defined, for the purpose of accreditation review as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. Distance education often incorporates technologies such as the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, in conjunction with any of the other technologies.~~

Distance Education means [34 CFR §602.3]:

Education that uses one or more of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (4) to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include –

- (1) The internet;*
- (2) One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;*
- (3) Audioconferencing; or*
- (4) Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).*

Definition of Correspondence Education

Correspondence education means [34 CFR §602/3]:

- (1) Education provided through one or more courses by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to student who are separated from the instructor.*
- (2) Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student.*
- (3) Correspondence courses are typically self-paced.*
- (4) Correspondence education is not distance education.*

~~A Correspondence course is:~~

- (1) A course provided by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student. Correspondence courses are typically self-paced;
- (2) A course which is part correspondence and part residential training, the Secretary considers the course to be a correspondence course; and,
- (3) Not distance education.

Policy

Commission ACCJC policy specifies that all learning opportunities provided by our accredited institutions *must* have the same *equivalent* quality, accountability, and focus on student outcomes, *regardless of mode of delivery*, whether they are delivered electronically or by more traditional means. *This intent of the policy is to provides* a framework that allows institutions the flexibility to adapt their delivery modes to the emerging needs of students and society while maintaining quality. Any institution offering courses and programs *electronically through distance education or correspondence education* is expected to meet the requirements of accreditation in each of its courses and programs and at each of its sites.

Policy Elements

- Development, implementation, and evaluation of all courses and programs, including those offered via distance education or correspondence education, must take place within the institution's total educational mission.
- Institutions are expected to control development, implementation, and evaluation of all courses and programs offered in their names, including those offered via distance education or correspondence education.
- Institutions are expected to have clearly defined and appropriate student learning outcomes for all courses and programs, including those delivered through distance education or correspondence education.
- Institutions are expected to provide the resources and structure needed to accomplish these outcomes *and to demonstrate that their students achieve these outcomes through application of appropriate assessment*.
- ~~• Institutions are expected to demonstrate that their students achieve these outcomes through application of rigorous assessment.~~
- ~~• Institutions are expected to provide the ACCJC reasons to believe that these outcomes will continue to be accomplished.~~
- Institutions are expected to provide the ACCJC advance notice of intent to initiate a new delivery mode, such as distance education or correspondence education, through the Substantive Change process.
- Institutions are expected to provide the ACCJC advance notice of intent to offer a program in which 50% or more of the courses are via distance education or correspondence education, through the Substantive Change process. *For purposes of this requirement, the institution is responsible for calculating the percentage of courses taught through distance or correspondence education.*
- Institutions which offer distance education or correspondence education *must* have processes in place through which the institution establishes that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence course or program is the same person who participates every time in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. This requirement will be met if the institution verifies the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the institution's discretion, such methods as a secure log-in and password, proctored examinations, and/or new or other technologies and/or practices that are developed and effective in verifying each student's identification. The institution must also publish to their students, policies that ensure the protection of student privacy and will notify students at the time of class registration of any charges associated with verification of student identity [34 CFR§602.17g].

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits
(First Reading June 2010, First Reading January 2011)

Background

The Accreditation Standards (particularly Standard II) and Eligibility Requirements 8 and 9 require institutions to meet generally accepted practices when awarding credit. These practices require evidence of:

- 1. academic study of sufficient content, breadth, and length;*
- 2. levels of rigor appropriate to the programs and/or degrees offered;*
- 3. statements of expected student learning outcomes relevant to the disciplines;*
- 4. assessment results which provide sufficient evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes.*

In response to federal requirements the Commission has developed a definition of credit hour for associate's degrees and adopted the federal definitions of terms related to institutional degrees and credits.

Policy Elements

An accredited institution conforms to a commonly accepted minimum program length of 60 semester credit hours or 90 quarter credit hours for associate's degrees. Any exception to this minimum, such as an institutional decision to award a degree on the basis of student achievement of defined learning outcomes for the degree, must be explained and justified. [34 CFR 600.2 & 668.8]

Federal Definitions

Contact hour or clock hour: *a unit of measure which represents an hour of scheduled instruction given to a student. [Source: IPEDS1]*

Credit or credit hour: *a unit of measure representing the equivalent of a hour (50 minutes) of instruction per week over the entire term and is applied to the total number of credit hours needed for completing requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate or other institutional award. [Source: IPEDS]*

Semester credit hour or semester hour: *a semester hour must include at least 15 clock hours of instruction [34 CFR 668.8]. The actual amount of academic work which goes into a single semester credit hour is often calculated as follows:*

- a. One lecture, seminar, or discussion credit hour represents 1 hour per week of scheduled class/seminar time and 2 hours of student preparation time. Most lecture and seminar courses are awarded 3 credit hours per semester, this formula represents at least 45 hours of class time and 90 hours of student preparation/study per semester.*
- b. One laboratory credit hour represents 1 hour per week of lecture or discussion time plus 1-2 hours per week of scheduled supervised or independent laboratory work, and 2 hours of student preparation time. Most laboratory courses are awarded up to 4 credit hours. For a laboratory course earning 3 credit hours, this formula represents at least 45 hours of class time, between 45 and 90 hours of laboratory time, and 90 hours of student preparation per semester.*

c. One practice credit hour (supervised clinical rounds, visual or performing art studio of supervised field work) represents 3-4 hours per week of work and this, in turn, represents between 45 and 60 hours of work per semester.

Quarter credit hour or quarter hour: *quarter credit hours represent proportionately less work than semester hours due to shorter terms; this equates to about two-thirds of a semester credit hour.[Source: USNEI2]*

Academic Year: *for the purposes of Federal student assistance programs, an academic year has a minimum of 30 weeks of instructional time for a course of study that measures its program length in credit hours or a minimum of 26 weeks of instructional time for a course of study that measures its program length in clock hours. A full time student is expected to complete at least 24 semester credit hours or 36 quarter credit hours in an academic year.[Source 20 USC 1088]*

An academic year in a direct assessment program is a period of instructional time that consists of a minimum of 30 weeks of instructional time during which a full time student is expected to complete the equivalent of at least 24 semester credit hours, 36 quarter hours or 900 clock hours. [34 CFR 668.10]

Program: *a combination of courses and related activities organized for the attainment of broad educational objectives described by the institution. These may include:*

Certificate: *a formal award certifying the satisfactory completion of a postsecondary education program;*
or Associate degree: *an award that requires completion of an organized program of study at the postsecondary level below the baccalaureate degree which is at least 2 but less than 4 years of full-time equivalent college work. [Source: IPEDS]*

Competency-Based or Direct Assessment Programs:

*Programs in which credits and degrees are awarded based solely on successful student demonstration of expected competencies, and not through credit or clock hours, are defined as **direct assessment programs**.*

A direct assessment program is an instructional program that, in lieu of credit hours or clock hours as a measure of student learning, utilizes direct assessment of student learning or recognizes the direct assessment of student learning by others. The assessment must be consistent with the accreditation of the institution or program utilizing assessment results. Direct assessment of student learning means a measure by the institution of what a student knows and what the student can demonstrate in terms of a body of knowledge and identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels which comprise the learning outcomes for the program. These measures provide evidence that a student has command of a specific subject, content area, or skills or that the student demonstrates a specific quality such as creativity, analysis or synthesis associated with the subject matter or program. Examples of direct measures include projects, papers, examinations, presentations, performances, and portfolios.

To be eligible, direct assessment programs must meet the requirements in 34 CFR 668.10. The institution must establish a methodology to reasonably equate the direct assessment program to credit or clock hours for the purposes of complying with applicable regulatory requirements. Institutions with direct assessment programs must apply to the Federal Secretary of Education for approval and must include documentation from ACCJC indicating that the Commission has evaluated the institution's offering of direct assessment program(s) and has included the program(s) in the institution's grant of accreditation. [Sources: 34 CFR 668.10 & 20 USC 1088]

1 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (<http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>)

2 U.S. Network for Education Information

(<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/edlite-index.html>)

Faculty Senate Meeting Exhibits, March 14, 2011

Best Practice Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education
Version 2.0, June 2009

See next page...

This list of best practice strategies is based on “Institutional Policies/Practices and Course Design Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education,” produced by WCET in February 2009 and updated in April 2009. In May 2009, the Instructional Technology Council (ITC) surveyed its membership to invite feedback and additional strategies to enhance the WCET work. This June 2009 document reflects the combined contributions of WCET, the UT TeleCampus of the University of Texas System, and ITC. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States license.

Institutional Context and Commitment

1. Establish a campus-wide policy on academic integrity that articulates faculty and student responsibilities.
2. Demonstrate an institutional commitment to enforcing the policy and in supporting faculty and staff in the handling of academic integrity matters.
3. Make information on academic integrity easy to find on the campus Web site, library Web site, department Web site, course, within the syllabus and within specific assignments.
4. Include ethics instruction within the core curriculum and/or area-specific within degree plans.
5. Address academic integrity at student orientation programs and events.
6. Encourage faculty to report every suspected violation and act upon it.
7. Secure student logins and password to access online courses and related resources, discussions, assignments and assessments.

Curriculum and Instruction

1. State the academic integrity/academic honesty policy within the online learning environment and discuss it early in the course.
2. Require student engagement with the academic integrity policy. For example:
 - a. Ask students for their input on how to create a community of integrity at the start of the course. This establishes the students as stakeholders in the community and the process of its formation.
 - b. Develop and ask students to commit to a class honor code.
 - c. Require students to read and sign an agreement to the campus academic integrity policy.

- d. Write a letter to students about integrity and post it in the course.
- e. Ask students to restate the academic integrity policy (this can also be used as a writing sample to use when grading and reviewing student work).
- f. Ask students to reflect on the academic integrity policy in the discussion board.
- g. Include a lesson on avoiding plagiarism.

3. Have assignments and activities in which appropriate sharing and collaboration is essential to successful completion. Foster a community of integrity by choosing authentic learning tasks that require group cohesiveness and effort. For example, focus assignments on distinctive, individual, and non-duplicative tasks or on what individual students self-identify as their personal learning needs.
4. Provide students with a course or course lesson on research and/or study skills. Work with library staff to design assignments and prepare materials on plagiarism and research techniques.

5. Include a statement that the instructor reserves the right to require alternative forms and/or locations of assessments (e.g., proctoring).
6. Ask students follow-up questions to assignments such as, "expand upon this statement you made," "tell me why you chose this phrase, description or reference," and "expand upon the ideas behind this reference."
7. Select one or two difficult concepts from the paper and ask the student to restate/rewrite the information.
8. Require students to share key learning from references for a paper or self-reflection on an assignment in the discussion board.
9. Include an ethical decision-making case study within the course.

Faculty Support

1. Incorporate academic integrity strategies into professional development and faculty training offerings.
2. Publish academic integrity strategies and policies in faculty handbook and Web-based faculty resources.
3. Publish guidelines for handling/reporting individual student infractions.
4. Assign a department academic integrity liaison to support faculty.
5. Use a plagiarism detection service.
6. Use Google to search for a unique text string or unique phrase from the paper.
7. Keep student papers filed in the department by topic for reference.

Student Support

1. Define academic integrity and cheating and clearly explain what is considered dishonest and unacceptable behavior.
2. Provide information and examples to help students understand the difference between collaboration on assignments and cheating, and identify plagiarism. Teach the proper use of citations.
3. State how much collaboration is permissible on each assignment.
4. State what the instructor's expectations are for the students and explain what they should expect from the instructor. For example:
 - a. Include a statement in the syllabus encouraging honest work.
 - b. Repeat the campus academic integrity statement and provide a link to campus policies.
 - c. Describe academic dishonesty.
 - d. Describe the repercussions for academic dishonesty.

- e. Describe permissible and impermissible collaboration.
- f. Include outside links to information on plagiarism, self-tests and examples.
- g. Include information on acceptable sources.
Include information about the college's writing center, library or other support.

5. Provide a writing style sheet or handbook with information on plagiarism and campus policies.
6. Indicate assessments may require follow-up documentation, questions or assignments.
7. State expectations for the time needed to complete coursework.
8. State whether the instructor/college will use a plagiarism detection service.

Assessment and Evaluation

1. Provide rubrics, or detailed grading criteria, for every assignment at the beginning of the course so students understand how they will be graded.
2. Train faculty on ways to use the settings on the college's learning management system to reduce cheating:
 - a. Use a test bank with more questions than will be used on any particular test and have the learning management system pull a smaller number of questions from the test bank
 - b. Randomize the order of answers for multiple test questions so for example, the correct answer for a particular question might be "a" for one student and "b" for another.
 - c. Require forced completion on exams so students cannot re-enter a test.
3. Set a short window for testing completion, i.e. one or two days to take an exam rather than a whole week. Setting a completion time reduces a student's ability to access the test, look up the

answer, and re-enter the test. Most test-taking software applications keep track of time on the server, not on the student's computer.

Password protect exams.

Show questions one at a time (makes more difficult for students to copy and paste the test in order to give it to someone else).

Use a Web browser lock-down service during testing.

Check the computer "properties" for the "creation date" and "author" for essay or term paper submissions if students are suspected of submitting work created by someone else.

Clarify that students with disabilities and requesting testing accommodations (extended time for completion of examinations and quizzes) must identify themselves to the college's office of disabilities and provide appropriate documentation.

Change test items and assignment topics each semester.

Emphasize assignments that require written work and problem solving (e.g., essays, papers, online discussions).

Use a variety of assessment strategies (quizzes, short and long papers, test questions that require the application of a theory or concept).

Adopt the following practices to encourage authentic written work:

Require students to turn in copies of reference articles with cited text highlighted.

Require annotated bibliographies.

Do not allow last minute changes in assignment topics.

Require specific references be used (this might be the course text).

Require an abstract.

Give narrow assignment topics (tied into class experience) and require thesis statements prior to topic approval.

Require students to turn in a draft, and their bibliography or references prior to the paper's due date.

Require students to write a concept paper and project plan prior to completing an assignment.

Evaluate the research process and the product.

After an assignment is due, have students post in the discussion board, describing the assignment and the research method used,

a summary of conclusions and an abstract (a meta-learning essay).

When evaluating student written work, consider following these practices:

Be wary of student writing that reads like an encyclopedia, newspaper article or expert in the field.

Look for whether a paper reflects the assignment, has changes in tense, includes odd sentences within a well-written paper, is based on references older than three years, refers to past events as current, or uses jargon.

Compare student writing on the discussion board with that on assignments and papers. A writing sample collected at the start of the semester can be helpful.

Compare the writing at the beginning and end of the paper with that in the middle of the paper -- language, sentence length and reading level.

Check references; compare quotations with cited sources; look for the same author in multiple references.

Read all papers on the same topic together.

Make assignments cumulative (students turn in parts of a project or paper throughout the semester).

Give open book exams.

Other than grades, do not provide students feedback on tests until all of the students in the class have completed them.

Use proctored test sites where appropriate.

Faculty should use a robust user name and password to protect their computer-based grade book and keep a printed copy in a secure place in case students are able to hack into the computer system.

Sources

"101 Ways to Maintain Academic Integrity in an Online Course," by Michael Anderson and Lori McNabb, UT TeleCampus, The University of Texas System. Handout for faculty development program.

McNabb, L., & Olmstead, A. "Communities of Integrity in Online Courses: Faculty Member Beliefs and Strategies." *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching* 5, no.2 (June 2009), 208-221. Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol5no2/mcnabb_0609.htm.

WCET Survey on Academic Integrity and Student Verification, August 2008.

"Institutional Policies/Practices and Course Design Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education," by WCET Working Group on Academic Integrity and Student Verification. February 2009 and revised April 2009.

Instructional Technology Council Survey on Best Practice Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education, May 2009.

"Best Practice Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education" by WCET, UT TeleCampus, and Instructional Technology Council is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 United States License. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at www.wcet.info or www.itcnetwork.org