



Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

La société pour l'avancement de la pédagogie dans  
l'enseignement supérieur

# Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

Number 35

May 2003

## From the President

*Gary Poole, STLHE President*

In another life, I played in the pit orchestra for a musical called *Working*. It is a musical that doesn't get produced very often and I really don't know why. There are some great songs in it.

And today at STLHE, life is imitating art. As I write, staff here at the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth are caught up in planning for STLHE 2003, coming to UBC this June.

### Inside this issue...

From the President	1
Using Learning Technology Well by Tony Bates	2
STLHE Strategic Planning Exercise	4
Green Guide No. 4	5
Alan Blizzard Award Winner	6
Academic Integrity: A Renewed Canadian Focus by Julia Christensen Hughes	7
New Editor for IJAD	10
Nominations Sought for STLHE President	10
STLHE 2003 Conference	11
For your information	12

In this issue of the Newsletter, Tony Bates shares some of his thoughts on the effective use of learning technology. Tony will also kick things off for us in June by delivering the opening plenary. We sincerely hope you can make plans to join us for what is shaping up to be a most interesting conference.

Recently, the STLHE Steering Committee met in Montreal, putting two more days of intense work into the Society's strategic plan. In this issue, we bring you up to date on that work.

Across the country, much work is being done in the area of Academic Integrity. A number of universities are administering surveys to assess the perceptions of students, faculty and teaching assistants. Others are conducting seminars on the topic. Some have declared an "Academic Integrity Week." Julia Christensen Hughes, who has been very instrumental in all this, provides some valuable information for us in this issue regarding the state of this work.

Finally, we celebrate the work of the team from the University of Alberta who are the most recent winners of the Blizzard award for collaboration in higher education. We look forward to their presentation at STLHE 2003, and to seeing many of you this June in Vancouver.

## Using Learning Technology Well

Tony Bates

*University of British Columbia*

The following is an excerpt from the first chapter of *Effective Teaching with Technology in Higher Education: Foundations for Success*, by Tony Bates and Gary Poole. In this excerpt, Tony Bates outlines barriers to the successful use of technology in teaching and then discusses issues related to the ways we can assess quality in teaching with technology.

### Barriers to the use of technology in teaching

There is constant pressure on the academy to do more with less. There are far more students, knowledge has increased exponentially, and academics have research, administration and public service to consider as well as teaching. Technology is often a possible solution to problems of quantity, but it usually needs to be accompanied by a re-organization of the way we work. Without such re-organization, though, technology becomes more work for instructors, because it becomes added to all their other duties. The additional workload that most instructors perceive to be an inevitable consequence of using technology for teaching is perhaps the most serious barrier to its increased use.

Another barrier to the use of technology is its potential threat to the power and control of teachers. It was two hundred years after the invention of the Gutenberg press before the University of Paris would allow students access to the books in the university library. This was not because the books were scarce, but because it was thought that allowing students access to books would undermine the authority of the teacher. Today, there is still a concern constantly raised by faculty

associations that technology threatens jobs, while at the same time they complain of overwork because of too many students. However, everything we know about teaching with technology suggests that the role of the teacher becomes more, not less, important, although technology is likely to require significant changes in the teacher's role.

Lastly, we need also to consider the rate of change in assessing the impact of technology on education. It took 50 years after the first books were printed and bound by the Gutenberg Press before someone had the bright idea of numbering pages. At the time of writing, it is a mere seven years since the first Web-based courses appeared. Technology is changing and developing faster than our capacity as individuals to adapt.

Furthermore, individuals adapt to technology faster than organizations. Senior managers are urging professors to make greater use of technology, but are often unaware of the organizational implications of this. Many of the problems faced by teachers in higher education in using technology result from the poor technical and pedagogical support they are given by their institutions. Because of the time needed by organizations to change, we need to see the introduction of new learning technologies such as the Web as a gradual process.

Thus tradition, authority and power, and issues of personal and organizational change, are also bound up with the use of technology, as well as issues about how we know and how best to learn and communicate. New technology is often seen as a threat to tradition and to the control of the academic profession over the process of learning.

We believe that technology is indeed a threat to traditional forms of teaching, but the question should not

be: 'How do we preserve the past?' but 'How can we best serve our students in today's society?' This may mean keeping some of the best or unique features of face-to-face teaching, but it also means looking at how the unique teaching potential of technology could best be developed to meet the needs of students today.

On the other hand, we do not believe that technology should be a threat to academic control over the process of teaching, provided university and college teachers learn how to use it properly, and provided that their institutions implement effective means of supporting the use of learning technologies.

### The challenge of quality

Probably the greatest challenge that universities and colleges face today is the need to maintain or even improve the quality of teaching and learning, given the changing circumstances in which they find themselves. Can technology help?

Although we shall see that the research evidence indicates clearly that technology-based teaching can be just as effective as face-to-face teaching, there is an understandable concern by many university and college teachers that teaching with technology must be inferior to face-to-face teaching.

#### *The validation of technology-based teaching*

Regional accreditation agencies and professional bodies indeed may have policies in place that prevent the recognition of technology-based or distance programs for accreditation or professional qualifications. For instance, at the time of writing the British Columbia College of Teachers, which is responsible for the evaluation of qualifications and the issuing of teaching certificates in the province, states that:

12. Correspondence-based or Distance Education teacher education programs are not recognized as comparable to British Columbia teacher education programs. Programs not regarded as comparable to BC programs will be denied certification.  
<http://bcct.ca/certification.html>

Similarly, rigid application of the 12-hour rule in the USA, has caused many difficulties for non-traditional students wishing to take alternative program offerings, such as distance education.

However, many regional accreditation and professional qualification bodies are now moving away from a blanket ban on a particular mode of delivery. Instead, they are assessing the quality of the programs, irrespective of delivery methods. This approach requires the development of proper quality assurance standards. While standards may be set, or agreed to, by the accreditation and qualification agencies, the responsibility for ensuring these standards are met falls on the institution offering the program.

The Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications (2000) in the USA has developed quality assurance standards for electronically delivered programs in conjunction with six regional accreditation boards (<http://www.wiche.edu/telecom/projects/balancing/principles.htm>). These standards cover the following areas:

- institutional context and commitment
- curriculum and instruction
- faculty support
- student support
- evaluation and assessment.

The Higher Education and Policy Council of the American Federation of Teachers has also established guidelines on distance learning (<http://www.aft.org/press/2001/011701.html>), based on the following principles:

1. Faculty must retain academic control.
2. Faculty must be prepared to meet the special requirements of teaching at a distance.
3. Course design should be shaped to the potential of the medium.
4. Students must fully understand course requirements and be prepared to succeed.
5. Close personal interaction must be maintained.
6. Class size should be set through normal faculty channels.
7. Courses should cover all material.
8. Experimentation with a broad range of subjects should be encouraged.
9. Equivalent research opportunities must be provided.
10. Student assessment should be comparable.
11. Equivalent advisement opportunities must be offered.
12. Faculty should retain creative control over use and re-use of materials.
13. Full undergraduate degree programs should include same-time same-place coursework.
14. Evaluation of distance coursework should be undertaken at all times.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy (2000) has also published a set of benchmarks for Internet-based distance education (<http://www.ihep.com/Pubs/PDF/Quality.pdf>). This report was funded jointly by the National Education Association (the largest professional association of higher education faculty in the USA) and Blackboard, Inc., owner of one of the main course development software platforms. The study identified 24 benchmarks, again grouped under the following headings:

- institutional support
- course development
- course structure
- student support
- faculty support
- evaluation and assessment.

Similar guidelines for quality assurance for distance education programs can be found from the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in Britain (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/public/dlg/append2.htm>). Lastly, McNaught (2002) describes the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology's institutional approach to quality assurance for online courses.

#### *Why quality assurance standards are not enough*

All these quality assurance approaches have a lot in common, for both distance and technology-based programs. In a sense this is good news, because it means that there is agreement about what is needed for a technology-based program to be considered of at least equivalent quality to a face-to-face program.

However, as Twigg (2001) points out, these standards are not so much benchmarks (measurable standards indicating world class quality), as goals to be achieved. Some important practices are missing from these lists, because they were not considered essential for reaching the same quality standards as face-to-face teaching, or because the standards represent the concerns of special interest groups (such as faculty) rather than the needs of learners. For instance, dropped from the IHEP benchmarks were standards concerned with collaborative learning, mastery learning, and accommodation to different learning styles.

Twigg (2001) furthermore argues that the standards so far agreed by these agencies are really minimum standards, designed to equate online or technology-based teaching with face-to-face teaching. She argues that it would be more useful to establish benchmarks that indicate world class standards for the use of technology. Rather than base standards on comparison with face-to-face

teaching, we should be establishing standards that represent best practice in technology-based teaching, even or especially if these are different from those of face-to-face teaching. Lastly, it is one thing to list goals or standards for technology-based teaching; it is quite another to know what to do to achieve them.

### Quality in teaching with technology

Many university and college teachers use technology for teaching without any formal training to do so. They learn by doing, and tend to work alone. In other words, they have transferred their face-to-face teaching methods with little or no adaptation to the use of technology for teaching. Furthermore, their face-to-face teaching methods are likely to be based on modeling the teaching methods that they learned as students from hopefully their best professors.

We believe that learning by doing is important - it is better to start to use technology for teaching than to wait until everything that is known about how to teach well with technology has been learned. However, our aim in this book is to enable teachers in higher education to achieve a high quality in their teaching with technology right from the start, while acknowledging that even with a good foundation, teaching will always improve with experience.

There are several key elements of quality in teaching with technology:

- content
- course or program planning
- instructional design
- media production
- moderating and supporting the learning experience
- student administration
- course or program evaluation and maintenance.

Content, at least in a high quality research university, should not be a

problem, provided that experienced tenured research professors are responsible for course content. If an institution does not have access to tenured research professors or other highly qualified experts, it may be possible to buy in technology-based content developed elsewhere by such professors or others who do have good content expertise. Instructors with lesser qualifications could then be hired to support the teaching of the pre-bought material. Even then, it is likely that pre-bought material may need to be adapted or modified for local use.

Content is of course an essential element in quality teaching. However, it is just as important with technology-based teaching to focus on the other quality issues of course and program planning, instructional design, media production, online moderating, and student support, as these issues will be new or different from those faced in conventional face-to-face teaching. Thus we agree with Carol Twigg that the aim is not to be as good as face-to-face teaching, but better, when using technology.

*Dr. Tony Bates is the Director of Distance Education and Technology in the Continuing Studies Division of the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, where he has worked since 1995. He will be giving the opening plenary at the 2003 STLHE conference in Vancouver. His talk will be entitled, "Technology Change, Teaching Shifts, and Learning Constants"*

### References

Institute for Higher Education Policy (2000). Quality on the Line: Benchmarks for Success in Internet-based Distance Education. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

McNaught, C. (2002). Quality assurance for online courses: Implementing policy at RMT, Assessment, Jan/Feb.

Twigg, C. (2001). Quality Assurance for whom? Providers and Consumers in Today's Distributed Learning Environment. Troy, NY: The Pew Learning and Technology Program, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications. (2000). Statement of the Regional Accrediting Commissions on the Evaluation of Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs. Boulder, CO: Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications.

## STLHE Strategic Planning Exercise — Second Progress Report

London, Ontario – February, 2003  
Montreal, Québec – April, 2003

In the last issue of the STLHE newsletter, we provided a summary of the STLHE Strategic Planning exercise. This summary spanned the entire planning process to that date. Since that report, the Steering Committee met in February at the University of Western Ontario for our annual winter meeting, and again in Montreal in April. As a result, the Strategic Planning exercise has taken yet another significant step forward.

Remember that the primary purpose of this exercise is to produce a set of guiding principles for the Society. In previous meetings, the Committee had hammered out a process for our planning. In London, we had reached the point where we needed specific content. It was time to start putting principles forward in a structured and well-worded fashion. Our work took the form of a detailed matrix providing both a framework for our Strategic Plan as well as content in the form of guiding principles.

The framework is based on the Society's overarching goals as outlined in the constitution. Briefly defined, these include the pursuit of teaching as scholarship, advocacy for excellence in teaching and learning, inclusiveness and broad representation in our activities, and the formation of strategic partnerships.

The matrix (or series of matrices, depending upon how you want to view the framework) was created by listing a series of specific objectives related to each overarching goal. These objectives make up the rows of the matrix. Then, for each objective, columns were created identifying the strategies for achieving the objective, and evidence the objective was being achieved. We also identified entities that would be responsible for each objective. At our February meeting, we began to complete the matrix. In April, we completed it.

Perhaps the most interesting and challenging time during our recent meetings has come when we have tested the matrix by discussing a

major proposal that had been put before us at an earlier point in the process. The proposal concerns the formation of a not-for-profit corporation (NFP), dedicated to the support of post-secondary teaching. As the Steering Committee discusses this proposal, we are using the matrix and its contents to see how well it guides our decision making. In the main, the matrix has stood up well.

#### Where to from here?

The Strategic Planning exercise calls for the presentation of a "finished product" to the STLHE membership at the Annual General Meeting as part of our Annual Conference in June (UBC, June 11-14). "Finished product" is in quotes because this process is never actually finished. Rather, it is iterative, as we continue to learn about ourselves as an organization, redevelop our vision, identify gaps between the vision and our current state of affairs, plan ways to reduce those gaps, then implement those plans.

If your conference plans for this year include Vancouver in June for STLHE (and we really hope they do!) we invite you to anticipate the AGM as an exciting milestone in the Society's development.

## Announcing the Publication of Green Guide No. 4!

The very successful Green Guide series has added another to its numbers. It's Serge Piccinin's *Feedback: Key to Learning*. Dr. Piccinin's Guide joins *Teaching Large Classes*, by Allan J. Gedalof, *Active Learning*, by Beverly J. Cameron, and *Teaching the Art of Inquiry*, by Bob Hudspith and Herb Jenkins.

### Green Guide No. 4: Feedback: Key to Learning

In this fourth Green Guide Serge Piccinin tackles a seminal issue for university teachers: how to give, receive, and act upon feedback to enhance learning and improve the quality of instruction. The guide describes a process that we often take for granted, yet can make or mar our effectiveness as teachers and learners. The author offers a wealth of insights and practical guidance for using feedback effectively, based on empirical research (much of it his own) and the accumulated wisdom of one of Canada's most respected educational developers and university teachers.

The idea of Green Guides originated with the Higher Education and Research Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA), who have now published more than 20 guides. HERDSA has very generously allowed us to use their title for our series, and we jointly publish some titles in both Canada and Australia.

Each guide costs \$10 Cdn., or \$9 US for all orders outside Canada. Unless otherwise requested, all orders will be sent via Canada Post. The shipping/handling rate for individual copies is \$3 and \$1 for each additional copy. Special shipment rates are available for bulk orders. Arrangements can be made to have shipments sent by courier. **ALL ORDERS MUT BE PREPAID.** For more information, contact Zita Hildebrandt at [OIDT@dal.ca](mailto:OIDT@dal.ca).

# The Alan Blizzard Award 2003

## “Always Ask *Why?*” Teaching Philosophy 101 - The “Supersection” Experience at the University of Alberta

Paul Beach, Cristina Bercea, Cressida Heyes, Jeff Hodgson, David Kahane, Lisa Kretz, Brian Leahy, Chris Lepock, Chris McTavish, Elizabeth Panasiuk, Jennifer Runke, John Simpson, Leah Armontrout Spencer, Jennifer Welchman

This project features the six-year evolution of the first large team-taught section of *Philosophy 101-A1: Introduction to Philosophy at the University of Alberta*.

The teaching team consists of three faculty members and eleven graduate teaching assistants with a wide variety of teaching experience and philosophical interests. The class is an introduction to ethical and political thinking, and is taught every fall to now 240 undergraduates, mostly first years fulfilling a Humanities requirement who are entirely new to philosophy. The three-credit, one semester course consists of two professor-led “lectures” and one TA-facilitated discussion section (of now about 25 students) per week.

### Project goals:

1. To show new students that philosophy is not a matter of paying silent homage to a bearded guy in a toga, but rather an intensely dialogic, skill building discipline that stresses originality, creative thinking, and the stepwise construction and defense of well-reasoned arguments.
2. To develop critical skills in ways that show students the relevance of philosophy to their own lives, recognizing that many will never take another course in the department.
3. To maintain high academic standards and expectations, while supporting students at all levels to meet them.
4. To foster active learning in both “lectures” and sections.
5. To match in a large class setting the excellent learning experience that the department has established in its seminar-style courses.
6. To create a forum to train new TAs in active learning techniques, and develop genuinely collaborative team-teaching in the department.

### What the professors have done:

1. Introduced diverse active learning techniques into the large classroom.
2. Developed learning technologies (a website and web-board) that enhance class community.
3. Designed a training course for new TAs.
4. Initiated weekly team meetings to set collective goals.
5. Taken responsibility for moderating TA feedback on students’ written work.
6. Observed TAs teaching and provided formal and informal feedback.

### What the TAs have done:

1. Developed a written and electronic database of shared teaching strategies and activities.
2. Undertaken to integrate active learning and individual attention to students into their teaching.
3. Formed a cooperative teaching group.
4. Mentored less experienced peers.
5. Become involved in interpreting and disseminating the pedagogical lessons of the course.
6. Observed professors teaching and provided formal and informal feedback.

There are many indicators of the program’s success, including self-reports of greater undergraduate confidence and engagement with philosophical skills, students continuing to other philosophy courses, teaching prizes, grants, and Faculty of Arts recognition. Official evaluations show an astonishing increase in student satisfaction with both course and instructors over the 1997-2002 period, and results for this course – especially for TAs – compare very favorably with similar courses in the Faculty of Arts. This large section is now rated as or more positively than the previously much more popular smaller sections of 101 it was initiated to replace. Less tangible but equally important is the model for collaborative and egalitarian team teaching that incorporates diverse faculty and graduate students.

### Contact person for the group:

Cressida Heyes, [cressida.heyes@ualberta.ca](mailto:cressida.heyes@ualberta.ca)

The Alan Blizzard Award  
An Award for Collaborative Projects that Improve Student Learning

### Sponsored by:

The Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE)  
McGraw-Hill Ryerson - Higher Education Division  
University Affairs, Canada’s higher education magazine

## Academic Integrity: A Renewed Canadian Focus

*Julia Christensen Hughes, PhD  
University of Guelph*

Over the past year universities from across the country have been renewing their focus on academic integrity. Committees have been struck, newsletters and handbooks written, workshops offered, surveys conducted, policies and penalties revisited, student orientation programs developed and *academic integrity weeks* declared. This is timely. Integrity is an essential value of democratic society in general, and of academe in particular, yet stories in the popular press and a growing body of research are calling into question our collective success at living this value.

Students are bombarded by stories in the press every day that reflect a lack of integrity on the part of business leaders, government officials and sports stars. A prevailing sentiment seems to be that the ends can be used to justify the means. Businesses, such as Enron, have been in the news for misrepresenting information on their financial statements, resulting in immense financial benefit for senior managers while defrauding millions of investors. More recently, CNN reported that 10 of the 19 pages contained within an intelligence dossier on Iraq presented first by Tony Blair to the British Government and then by Colin Powell to the UN, were plagiarized - complete with original grammatical and spelling errors. The

material, with no attribution, was taken from a journal article written by a PhD student based on data collected in 1991 at the time of the Gulf War (CNN, 2003). Within the sports arena, cheating is also in evidence. For example, the Olympics continue to be scandalized by questionable judging practices and athletes who use performance enhancing drugs. This “win at all costs” mentality can also be found within professional sports teams. Vince Carter, star of the Toronto Raptors, when asked what was needed to turn his team around, replied “We just have to do it, plain and simple...I don’t care how we get the win, even if we cheat. That’s where we are right now” (McLeod, 2003; p. S5).

Research suggests that these behaviours – the misrepresentation of data, plagiarism, and cheating to win – are gaining a foothold in the academic environment. Don McCabe, founder of the Center for Academic Integrity ([www.academicintegrity.org](http://www.academicintegrity.org)) at Duke University has been conducting research on academic misconduct for over ten years. Based on his research with over 20,000 students from over 70 universities across the United States, McCabe has concluded that cheating amongst university students is commonplace (McCabe, 2002). He has also determined that some forms of cheating have increased dramatically over the last several decades. In comparing his results to those of a similar study conducted by Bowers (1964), McCabe concluded, “the most serious test cheating behaviors –

copying from another student during a test or exam, helping another to cheat, and using crib notes – have all increased substantially” (McCabe and Trevino, 1996; 31).

McCabe’s research has also resulted in the identification of a number of factors that may be associated with self-reported levels of academic dishonesty (McCabe and Trevino, 1993; 531). These include:

- *Whether or not the university has an explicit honour code* (i.e., an honour pledge, unsupervised exams, an expectation that students report violations by others, and a peer-based judiciary).
- *How well academic integrity policies are understood and accepted* (i.e., student perception of the level of student and faculty understanding and acceptance of academic integrity policies, as well as the perceived effectiveness of these policies).
- The perceived certainty of being reported by a peer.
- The perceived severity of penalties.
- Perceptions of the extent of peers’ cheating behaviour.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) found that students who reported engaging in higher levels of academic misconduct were more likely to be enrolled at a university without an honour code. They were also found to be more likely to perceive a lower level of understanding and acceptance

of academic integrity policies by students and faculty, a lower certainty of being reported by a peer, a lower severity of penalties, and a higher degree of cheating by their peers.

Inspired by McCabe's work, and in an effort to ensure the integrity of their own campuses, 11 Canadian universities recently implemented a Canadian version of the McCabe survey. Several more plan to implement it this coming fall. To date, almost 17,000 students and 2,000 faculty have participated in the Canadian study. Similar to McCabe's earlier work, the study explores the extent of self-reported academic misconduct amongst students, perceptions of the seriousness of various behaviours, factors that may be associated with higher levels of misconduct, and suggestions for helping support a culture of academic integrity. Over the coming year individual universities will be working with their own results, and Don McCabe and I will be analyzing the Canadian data set.

In the meantime, in the numerous workshops and discussions that have been occurring on Canadian campuses, many suggestions have been generated for helping faculty reinforce academic integrity and discourage academic misconduct in their courses. Excellent resources have also been written (see for example, Harris, 2002). These suggestions include:

### **Educate your Students on Integrity**

□ Share your views on academic integrity with your students (how you define it, why you believe it's important – to you, to them individually, to the university, and to society as a whole).

□ Clarify to your students your understanding and support of your university's academic misconduct policies.

□ Tell your students about the types of penalties you've levied in the past and for what types of offences.

□ Have someone from your university's learning and writing centre run a class for your students on paraphrasing and citation – or run the class yourself. Spend as much time discussing why it's important as you spend teaching the citation norms within your discipline.

### **Support your University's Policies and Penalties**

□ Tell your students that you will follow up on any suspected cases of academic misconduct – according to university policy - and keep your word.

□ Avoid the temptation to make private deals outside the formal system with your students – it can send the message that you don't take academic integrity seriously and prevents students with multiple offences from being detected.

□ If you don't support your university's policies, volunteer to

participate on a review committee (policies across the country are currently being rewritten in response to the emerging research).

□ Model integrity in your teaching (clearly cite sources in your own lectures, handouts etc.).

### **Design Assignments and Exams with a Focus on Learning and Minimize the Opportunity for Misconduct**

□ Require the use of novel components in your assignments. Ask students to incorporate empirical data that you've provided or they've collected themselves. Have them draw on a specific article discussed in class or a current event.

□ Break large assignments down into small pieces (topic, outline, annotated bibliography, first draft, completed paper) and require students to incorporate feedback received (from yourself and/or peers) in subsequent submissions.

□ Clearly specify – in writing - when your students are encouraged to collaborate and when you expect them to work individually.

□ Have students submit a copy of the first page of every article referenced in their bibliography.

□ Make copies of old exams, lab reports and assignments available to all your students (no matter how carefully you count your copies, once an exam has been written or an

assignment handed in, it's "out there").

□ Regularly change your exams, labs and assignments.

□ Test higher-order thinking skills (problem solving, synthesis, application) as opposed to mere recall.

### **Demonstrate to Your Students That you Take Invigilation Seriously**

□ Invigilate all of your exams – mid-terms and finals – equally seriously.

□ Arrange to have all of your students, in a multiple-sectioned course, write the exam at the same time.

□ Require photo I.D.; disallow baseball hats; disallow electronic communication devices (pagers, cell phones); have students place all personal belongings at the front of the room; have students sign in and out.

□ Ensure an appropriate physical location – ample writing space with room between students for you to circulate.

□ Use an open book format or allow students to bring in a sheet with summary points, formulae etc.

□ Hand back assignments and exams in a secure environment (to protect student privacy and prevent "shopping" for next semester's "A" papers, lab reports and exams).

□ If you suspect plagiarism on an assignment, use plagiarism detection

software or a search engine to check a portion of the paper against web-based materials.

□ Know what your university's policies require you to do if you suspect, or if a student or TA reports to you that he or she suspects, a student for cheating.

While not all of these suggestions will be appropriate or possible in every situation, it is essential that as faculty we seek to identify strategies that we can use to help create and enhance cultures of integrity within our courses and the university community as a whole. If you have used any strategies that you feel have been particularly effective at enhancing integrity within your course(s), I would appreciate hearing from you (jchriste@uoguelph.ca). Suggestions received will be summarized and presented during the upcoming STLHE conference in Vancouver.

## **References**

Bowers, W. (1964). Student dishonesty and its control in college. New York: Bureau of Allied Social Research, Columbia University.

CNN (2003). UK accused of lifting dossier text. Friday, February 7. [available: <http://europe.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/02/07/sprj.irq.uk.dossier/>, 02/18/03].

Harris, R. (2001). Anti-plagiarism strategies for research papers. [available: <http://www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm>, 03/07/02]

McCabe, D. (2002). Student cheating: Understanding the cultural context. Academic Integrity: Challenges and Achievements at the University of Guelph. 15<sup>th</sup> annual Learning and Teaching Innovations Conference, University of Guelph, May 15, 2002.

McCabe, D. and Trevino L. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. Change, 28 (1) 28-33.

McCabe, D. and Trevino L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. Journal of Higher Education, 64, 522-538.

McLeod, R. (2003). Carter Eager to Play. Globe and Mail, Thursday, January 9, S5.

---

## Nominations Sought for STLHE President

STLHE will be electing a new President to take office in June 2004. The President of STLHE is a Society member who chairs the Steering Committee and oversees the Society's activities, in accordance with its Constitution, By-Laws, and Strategic Plan. The term of office as President is two years, with an option to renew for a second term. The appointment is preceded by a year as President-Elect, beginning June 2003. Nominations can be sent to:

Pat Rogers  
Dean, Faculty of Education  
University of Windsor  
Windsor, Ont. N9B 3P4  
Fax: 519-971-3612  
Email: [progers@uwindsor.ca](mailto:progers@uwindsor.ca)

---

---

## A New Editor for the International Journal for Academic Development

We are pleased to announce that Lynn McAlpine, from McGill University, has taken over from Christopher Knapper as an editor of IJAD. Dr. McAlpine brings a wealth of experience in higher education research and publishing and she is an active member of STLHE. We are very pleased that our fine representation on the IJAD editorial team, which was so ably managed by Christopher Knapper, will be continued by Lynn McAlpine. Note that the IJAD insert provided with this issue of the newsletter was printed before Lynn took over.

University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, B.C.  
June 11 - 14, 2003

# STLHE 2003

June 11 - 14, 2003

## Plus Ça Change...

An exploration of transition and transformation in higher education

**For further information contact:**

Gary Poole

STLHE Conference Chair

University of British Columbia

Centre for Teaching and Academic  
Growth

6326 Agricultural Road

Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z2

**Telephone:** 604-822-9164

**Email:** gary.poole@ubc.ca

**Fax:** 604-822-9826

[www.ubcconferences.com/events/stlhe](http://www.ubcconferences.com/events/stlhe)

## Unable to attend the STLHE Conference this year?

Then please renew  
your STLHE  
membership by  
submitting the enclosed  
Membership Form.

## STLHE Steering Committee

*British Columbia:* Harry Hubball, UBC

*Alberta:* Rick Vanderlee, Calgary

*Saskatchewan/Manitoba:* James McNinch, Regina

*Ontario Southwest:* Julia Christensen Hughes, Guelph

*Ontario Central:* Judy Britnell, Ryerson

*Ontario Northeast:* Susan Wilcox, Queen's

*Anglophone Quebec:* Heather MacKenzie, Concordia

*Francophone Quebec:* André Bourret, UQAM

*Nova Scotia:* Margaret-Anne Bennett, St. Mary's

*Newfoundland/New Brunswick/PEI:* Eileen Bragg, Memorial

### Ex-officio

*President:* Gary Poole, UBC

*Past President:* Pat Rogers, Windsor

*Chair, Publications Committee:* Alan Wright, Université de  
Québec

*Treasurer:* Christine Kurbis, SFU

## Electronic discussion forum

The STLHE electronic mail forum has been active since October 1988 and has over 500 subscribers. The purpose of the forum is to exchange opinions, ideas and experiences of concern to STLHE members and others who are interested in the subject of teaching and learning in higher education. The forum also posts STLHE announcements and news.

To subscribe to the forum, contact the list coordinator, Russ Hunt, by email: [hunt@StThomasU.ca](mailto:hunt@StThomasU.ca), or send the following on-line message to [listserv@unb.ca](mailto:listserv@unb.ca)

### **SUB STLHE-L Your full name**

After receiving confirmation of your subscription from the listserv, your correspondence to the Forum should be addressed to STLHE-L@UNB.CA

## Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

*Newsletter of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, No. 35, May 2003*

*Editor:* Gary Poole. *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* is published by the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE/SAPES). STLHE is a national association of academics interested in the improvement of teaching and learning in higher education. The society sponsors an annual conference, the 3M Teaching Fellowships, an electronic discussion forum, and a variety of other initiatives and publications. The membership is comprised mainly of faculty and teaching and learning resource professionals from post-secondary institutions across Canada and beyond.

Material in *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* may be reprinted or photocopied for internal use within Canada. Please note appropriate credit and, as a courtesy to the author, forward two copies of the reprint to STLHE/SAPES.

Address all correspondence to: President STLHE/SAPES, c/o Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth, University of British Columbia, 6326 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z2. Tel: (604) 822-9164, fax: (604) 822-9826, email: [gary.poole@ubc.ca](mailto:gary.poole@ubc.ca), <http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/stlhe/>