**TO:**Steering Committee

**FROM:**Committee on Academic Programs

**RE:**Preliminary Recommendation on theCharge on Academic Integrity

**DATE:**October 12, 2012

**Introduction:**

In 2007, an *ad hoc* Committee released a report on the Academic Integrity Policy that had been in place since 1997.  In the report, the Committee outlined the effectiveness of the policy since its implementation and offered suggestions for improvement.  Among the recommendations were: a clear definition of academic integrity, an elaboration of academic dishonesty, an annual update of cases and examples for illustration, an *ad hoc* committee of students and faculty to consult with the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) for consistency across schools, a continuation of the formal presentation on academic integrity to First Semester Seminars (FSP) that incorporates SGA representatives, a requirement that students to complete an online tutorial and sign a statement acknowledging policy, the inclusion of instruction on policy in Community Learning Day events, closer instruction to departments and programs on policy and procedure, a requirement that faculty include a statement on policy in their syllabi, and the creation a mechanism for students to demonstrate the authenticity of their work and acknowledge the decision in the cases of an infraction.  TCNJ applied some of the recommendations in subsequent years, but left some parts unfulfilled.

In December 2010, Tom Hagedorn, the FSP coordinator, brought the following issues to Steering and requested that CAP add them to its considerations: the place of internet sources and new technologies in the Policy, a clear definition of “teacher-scholar,” faculty complement to undergraduate policy, and a positive statement of TCNJ’s values regarding academic integrity.

**Charge:**

The Steering Committee charges CAP to review TCNJ’s Academic Integrity Policy and to determine the extent to which it needs to be updated. The enduring principles on which it is based should be clearly stated. In doing so, CAP is asked to: consider issues of electronic media and fair use; determine whether the policy should be rephrased in a positive, as opposed to a negative voice; and, determine what, if any, explanation for why TCNJ is "a community of scholars and learners who respect and believe in academic integrity" should be included. The report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Integrity should be considered as preliminary testimony.

**Background to the Recommendation:**

In its review of the policy on academic integrity CAP solicited feedback from broad and diverse stakeholders, including a member of the *ad hoc* committee, Don Lovett; Steering, Nancy Freudenthal; and Student Life, Angela Lauer Chong.  It also gathered supporting materials, such as documents and materials from the Academic Integrity presentation given to FSP classes annually and input from the All-College Integrity Board and codes from the American School Counselor Association’s (ASCA) standards on academic integrity.

Additionally, CAP formed a subcommittee of the following members:

Richard Kamber (Convener)

John Laughton

Stephanie Shestakow

David Morales

Adam Bonanno

Christopher Fisher

The subcommittee focused on changes to the policy’s language and definition, the meaning of what comprises a “community of scholars and learners,” and whether TCNJ’s current policy addresses the use of electronic media and new technologies.

**Preliminary Recommendation:**

CAP’s preliminary recommendation is that TCNJ update the current policy on academic integrity to clarify its principles, include electronic media and new technologies within its purview, state its objectives in positive terms, define a “community of scholars and learners,” and place that definition at its core.

Moreover, it is CAP’s recommendation that Steering charge CAP to lead a campus-wide initiative to revise the policy on academic integrity.