Analysis of Students’ Answer to the Open-Ended Question:
Suggested Changes to Academic Integrity Policy

The categories described below are the result of the analysis made by SPPS Text Analysis for Surveys to the open-ended question “suggested changes to the academic integrity policy”. The final 12 categories used to explain the students’ point of view regarding the required changes to the Academic Integrity Policy are the result of a combination of more than 50 categories that were created by this software. The categories listed below are reported by frequency in the amount of responses, and the graphs show the relationships among categories.

Only 11 out of the 12 categories were developed in this report, since the category labeled USF showed a very similar behavior to the faculty category. This is explained due to the fact that most students’ responses maintained that USF should enforce the academic integrity policy through its faculty. Similarly, they stated that the faculty, as part of USF, has to do the same. Therefore, the behavior of these two categories was summarized by faculty behavior.

In general, students are aware of the academic integrity policy at USF; however, they sustained that it is not fully enforced by the faculty. A considerable number of responses mentioned that students have witnessed unethical behavior in other students; unfortunately, most of these cases were not penalized properly by USF and/or faculty.
1. **Students.**

This category includes all the answers where students report themselves as the principal agents involved when it comes to unethical behavior. Most of them maintained that it is the students’ responsibility not to incur in cheating or any type of unethical behavior. However, there is a large group of responses that are strongly related to the relationship with the faculty as well as USF regulations and policies. From the 147 responses that involved students, 54 (37%) also involved faculty as a way to prevent cheating through the coordination of both groups. Some of the issues mostly mentioned by the students are that professors should discuss more about the academic integrity policy, and also that they should focus more in the student’s learning process rather than in the amount of work given in class. On the other hand, 44 (30%) responses that cited students also mentioned how USF has influenced them to incur into cheating or not. In general, students think that the school has a good policy, but it is not fully known by the students; thus, the school has to encourage faculty to enforce the academic integrity policy. Other categories strongly related to students are associated to integrity and learning: 39 (27%) responses stated that the integrity of students is the main value to prevent cheating; and 30 (20%) responses stated that when they are interested in the learning process more than just passing the class, students will be less likely to incur into any unethical behavior.
2. **Faculty.**
   This category includes all the answers where students believe that it is the faculty’s responsibility to make clear and emphasize about the Academic Integrity Policy. Most responses mention that the unethical behavior of students in assignments or exams is due to ambiguity in the policy explanation and/or enforcement by faculty. 54 (70%) of the responses maintained that it is the relationship professor-student that will prevent cheating by making the rules clear at the beginning of each course. It is also important to mention that 22 (29%) of the responses sustained that professors should make use of different devices to control unethical behavior, such as the use of different websites to discover plagiarism in assignments, or the prohibition of electronic devices during exams. Finally, among assignments and exams, there were 31 (40%) responses that sustained that unethical behavior starts in faculty when they recycle exams and assignments from previous years, which persuade student to look for this material, and incur into unethical behavior.
3. **Integrity.**
This category includes all the responses that mentioned integrity as a value to prevent unethical behavior as well as those related to how students follow USF’s academic integrity policy. 39 (67%) of the responses maintained that students should enhance academic integrity; however, some students stated that this is not strongly enforced. 26 (46%) responses stated that this should be done through USF, and 21 (38%) responses mentioned that students should learn about it through faculty. Several responses showed that students are not fully aware of the academic integrity policy, and that faculty barely goes over it.
4. **Learning.**

This category includes all the responses that emphasize the learning process of students related to unethical behavior. 30 (64%) responses showed a strong relationship in how students find the learning process a factor to cheat, whether this occurs on assignments or exams. Students declared that they are more concerned on passing the class than in learning the material, probably due to the enforcement of learning topics that they will not use in their professional lives. Additionally, 19 (40%) responses are related to assignments and the learning process, where students’ responses reported time problems, meaning that the amount of work in some assignments and courses interferes with their learning, and drives them to cheat. Also, there is a strong relationship between learning and faculty, where 15 (32%) responses maintained that it is the professors’ responsibility to look after for the proper learning process for students as well as to specify clearly the rules in each class.
5. **Devices**

This category includes all the responses that mention the use of other tools to complete assignments or exams, such as website resources, PDA’s, cell phones, and others. From the 42 responses that mentioned the use of different devices to prevent cheating: 26 (62%) responses maintained that students should be banned from using some electronic devices during exams, such as cell phones and/or calculators. On the other hand, 22 (52%) responses suggested that faculty should use some devices to help them monitor students and prevent them from cheating.
6. Rules
In this category all the responses associated with the enforcement and knowledge of rules were included. Most of the responses that mentioned the enforcement and understanding of rules are associated with the student’s category, where 25 (61%) responses related students to USF rules; unfortunately, most of the responses stated that the rules are not well-understood by students, and that a major enforcement is required. On the other hand, 12 (29%) responses stated that it is USF who has to clarify and specify the academic integrity policy (rules) in order to enforce the proper behavior by the students. Furthermore, 12 responses (29) stated that this has to be done through the faculty.
7. **Report**
This category includes all the responses related to how unethical behavior should be reported at USF. 29 (81%) responses show that students have been related to or have witnessed some sort of unethical behavior; however, most of the responses stated that it is not the student’s responsibility to report this. In fact, it would be very rare if a student turns another student in. In addition, 14 (39%) responses stated that it is the faculty who should be in charge of controlling, reporting and penalizing this behavior. Finally, 10 (28%) responses mentioned that USF should be responsible to enforce the rules through its faculty.
8. **Penalties**

This category includes all the responses related to how unethical behavior has or should be penalized at USF. 24 (67%) responses mentioned that students should be responsible and penalized whenever they cheat. However, 14 (39%) responses stated that USF needs to enforce and be consistent with the policies; in most of the responses, students reported that, in the case of cheating, USF has not penalized students properly, and in some cases it has ignored it. Moreover, 10 (28%) responses mentioned that faculty do not enforce penalties properly. Additionally, 12 (33%) responses stated that penalizing unethical behavior will enhance the academic integrity.
9. **Assignments.**

In this category, students maintained that the way professors assign homework or papers could influence the students’ behavior. From the 34 responses cited in this category, 25 (74%) responses stated that students could cheat in assignments due to overloads class work as well as due to the availability of assignments made by students in previous semesters. However, 18 (53%) responses mentioned that faculty could avoid this behavior by giving always new topics for assignments in their classes. Finally, 19 (56%) responses stated that this affects their learning process.
10. Classes.
The development of classes also showed a relationship between students and unethical behavior. 21 (70%) out of 30 responses stated that students had taken classes where the academic integrity policy has not been explained properly; also, students maintain that some classes overloaded them with work that was not relevant to their learning process, which had led some students to cheat. On the other hand, 16 (53%) responses sustained that the way faculty develops some classes and enforces the rules from the beginning will affect the academic integrity policy at USF. Finally 10 (33%) responses supported the idea that faculty should make use of some devices to control and enforce the proper behavior in classes, such as banning electronic devices or using bigger rooms to take exams.
11. Exams.
As in the case of assignments, 27 responses related the way professors prepare their exams to cheating. 20 out of the 27 responses (74%) stated that students should not be responsible for monitoring unethical behavior during exams, while 13 (48%) responses mentioned that it should be a faculty task, whether this is done by monitoring exams better, or by preparing new material to test students’ knowledge. On the other hand, 11 (41%) responses related some procedures (label as devices) to enforce the proper behavior, such as banning electronic devices, not allowing students to leave the classroom during exams, and not leaving students by themselves while taking a test.