

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Best Practice Programme in Promoting Academic Integrity

CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
II. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE	3
III. GENERAL OBJECTIVE	4
IV. CATEGORIES OF PRACTICES ON PROMOTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY.....	4
1. TEACHING AND LEARNING	4
2. POLICY	5
3. PROCEDURES.....	5
4. COMMUNICATION	5
5. GOVERNANCE/STRUCTURES	6
6. TRAINING	6
V. WHO CAN APPLY?.....	7
VI. HOW TO APPLY?	7
VII. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURE.....	7
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING BEST PRACTICES	7
VIII. INDICATIVE TIMETABLE	9

HOW TO APPLY?

- Complete the **Application Form** (See **Appendix I**) in English or French
- Attach any additional documents supporting your application (e.g., evaluation report on the impact of your good practice)
- Send these documents in electronic form (Word and/or PDF) to the following e-mail address: etined@coe.int. Emails should contain the following reference in subject: **Call for Best Practices in Promoting Academic Integrity during COVID-19**. Applications must be received **before 20 August 2021**.

I. INTRODUCTION

Academic integrity is under increasing threat. It is threatened by technological advancements, the commercialisation of higher education, the burgeoning essay mills industry, reduced governmental funding for education, and corruption in governments. In some cases, it is challenged by direct or indirect political pressure from public authorities.

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has severely impacted the entire higher education sector across Europe and globally causing closure of higher education institutions and the interruption of classroom-based forms of teaching and learning. Higher education institutions in many European countries have turned to emergency remote teaching, learning and assessment using a variety of technologies as an immediate measure until the return of “normality.” Such a dramatic shift to remote mode of education delivery may have had further implications for academic integrity. Although higher education institutions still need to collect data, early evidence suggests that academic file sharing and academic outsourcing may have increased during the shift to emergency remote learning imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic¹.

These forces, coupled with the diversity of views and experiences with academic integrity, mean that higher education institutions must actively and proactively promote academic integrity in order to create shared understanding and a culture of integrity, both of which support ethical behaviour.

II. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Promoting academic integrity remains fundamental to the credibility of higher education institutions and providing quality online and in-person education, even during emergency conditions.

Promoting academic integrity helps to protect the quality of higher education degrees so that they accurately represent the underlying skills, competencies and attitudes expected. Promoting academic integrity also instils integrity-based practices in graduates. In other words, academic integrity is fundamental for individual, professional, and governmental integrity.

The Council of Europe is committed to supporting member States in strengthening the principles of ethics, transparency and integration in education and ensuring quality education. Launched in 2015 by the (then) Minister of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, Ms Kateřina Valachová and the Director General of Democracy of the Council of Europe, Ms Snežana Samardžić-Marković, [the Council of Europe Platform on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education \(ETINED\)](#), is a network of specialists appointed by member States of the Council of Europe and of States Parties to the European Cultural Convention. ETINED facilitates international cooperation and peer-learning through sharing information, good practices, defining guidelines on the subject and developing capacity-building for all actors.

ETINED proposes a new approach to ethics, transparency and integrity in education based on the idea that quality education will only be achieved, and corruption effectively addressed, if all relevant sectors of society commit fully to fundamental positive ethical principles for public and professional life. Essentially, integrity is then seen as the connection between positive ethical principles and quality in education.

In this context, the Council of Europe is launching a Best Practice Programme in Promoting Academic Integrity. The aim of the Programme is to identify, publicly recognise and disseminate relevant practices in promoting academic integrity throughout higher education institutions in Europe, in light of the difficulties that have transpired since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹ Eaton, S. E. (2020). Academic Integrity During COVID-19: Reflections from the University of Calgary. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 48(1), 80-85.

Good practices help stimulate changes in behaviour and culture by raising awareness of academic integrity, increasing the desire of staff and students to protect and uphold integrity, and enhancing their knowledge of how to act differently; awareness, desire and knowledge are the three key requirements for successful change².

III. GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The aim of the call is to identify good practices in promoting/safeguarding academic integrity in light of the difficulties that have transpired since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The relevant practices, identified through the present call, will be published in a compilation of practices on promoting academic integrity and will be disseminated to other higher education institutions, using the ETINED Platform and other means. Responding to this call will give higher education institutions the opportunity to showcase and publicise their practices, resulting in increased attention for and possible adoption of the practices in other Council of Europe member States. The relevant practices will also be recognised during an award ceremony held in Strasbourg or online at the end of 2021.

IV. CATEGORIES OF PRACTICES ON PROMOTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Promotion does not simply mean talking about academic integrity, but rather working actively and proactively to ensure it. It includes encouraging and supporting the infrastructures, policies and processes that advance the progress of academic integrity and the building of integrity cultures. In this context, the Council of Europe is calling for relevant practices in any of the following 6 categories: teaching and learning, policy, procedures, communication, governance/structures, and training.

1. Teaching and Learning

Academic integrity can be advanced through pedagogical choices, learner support, and assessment design, particularly when there is strong institutional support for teaching and learning.³ Studies have shown that students are more likely to resort to breaches of academic integrity due to factors such as poor time management, significant stress, inability to follow a course, many of which were exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.⁴

The Council of Europe thus is looking to showcase teaching and learning practices that promote a culture of integrity in online and blended learning environments. Teaching and learning practices can include active online or blended learning classes, good instruction, meaningful and authentic assessments, learning activities that build meta-cognition, and, mastery versus performance-orientated environments. Strong institutional support practices might manifest as course relief for faculty to revamp their classrooms to implement best practices, and widely available learner support (e.g., writing centres, tutorial services). Efforts to educate students after an integrity breach is another example of a teaching and learning practice; an educative, rather than punitive, focus of the best practice is fundamental to promoting academic integrity.⁵

² Hiatt, J. (2006). ADKAR: A model for change in business, government and our community. Prosci Learning Center Publications.

³ Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). Academic Integrity as a Teaching & Learning Issue: From Theory into Practice, 56, 88-94. Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., van Haeringen, K., Saddiqui, S., & Rozenberg, P. (2019). Contract cheating and assessment design: Exploring the relationship. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44 (5), 676-691.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1527892>

Council of Europe (2018). South-East European Project on Policies for Academic Integrity. ETINED, Volume 5
Murdock, T.B., Miller, A.D., & Goetzinger, A. (2007). Effects of classroom context on university students' judgments about cheating: Mediating and moderating processes. *Social Psychology of Education*, 10, 141-169 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-007-901501>

⁴ Tindall, I & Curtis, G (2020) 'Negative Emotionality Predicts Attitudes Toward Plagiarism', *Journal of Academic Ethics*, Vol. 18 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09343-3>

⁵ Bertram Gallant, T., & Stephens, J.M. (in press). Punishment is not enough: The moral imperative of responding to cheating with a developmental approach. *Journal of College & Character*.

2. Policy

A good academic integrity policy is essential for promoting academic integrity because it helps to ensure fair and responsible responses to integrity breaches, and clearly articulated policies can instil institutional change.⁶ Relevant policy practice includes a grounding moral/student development theory, so that the policy is more focused on educating and development and not on punishing students. The policy should be campus-wide, easy to locate and read, clearly outlining the responsibilities of all stakeholders, providing sufficient detail of breaches, and informing readers of the support that exists for upholding integrity.⁷

Under this category, the Council of Europe is looking to highlight examples of relevant academic policies that were drawn upon during the crisis and/or modifications or enactments of new academic integrity policies that address the challenges brought about by mass online learning and teaching.

3. Procedures

The procedures for responding to integrity breaches are a crucial component for promoting academic integrity. If the procedures are perceived to not be fair, responsible, respectful or trustworthy, there will be little community buy-in to academic integrity. The best procedural practices include, at the very least – due process, which can be simply described as giving students the right to be notified that they are suspected of a breach and the opportunity to give their response to the notice.⁸ Best procedural practices can also include a clear and standardised categorisation of integrity breaches and the transparent communication of how each category will be responded to. Finally, procedures that are focused on restoring harm, rather than punishing students, tend to be more effective and therefore may be considered good practice.⁹

Having challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic in mind, this category aims to highlight how these procedures were operationalised to ensure due process in identifying and responding to academic breaches during the online and blended delivery of classes.

4. Communication

The challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic accelerate the urgency of communicating academic integrity messages to the whole higher education community. As an immediate response, acknowledging the added pressure on students, communicating the importance of academic integrity and explaining what constitutes a breach of academic integrity in online environments can help to remediate some of the uncertainties created by the sudden shift to distance teaching and learning. Overall, communication about institutional expectations, values and beliefs (and policy) is necessary for creating shared understanding within a diverse community and countering contrary beliefs long-held by members of the

⁶ Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M.C., Walker, R.G., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Partridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7 (2), 3-12.

Kibler, W.L., (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal*, 31 (1), 8-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1993.11072332>

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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877042000241760>

⁷ Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M.C., Walker, R.G., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Partridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7 (2), 3-12.

⁸ McCabe, D. & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 32 (5), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380009605738>

⁹ Karp, D.R., & Sacks, C. (2012). Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: Findings from the STARR project: A student accountability and restorative research project. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 17 (2), 154-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2014.915140>

community.¹⁰ Communication by institutions and faculty also counter the “cheating-as-a-strategy” narrative that might exist within a society which sees tertiary education as an economic necessity rather than learning opportunity.¹¹ Best communication practices may present a visible presence of ethics/integrity in educational campaigns, messages sent to students etc. And finally, communication about academic integrity must be delivered by the instructors to the students in course syllabi, lectures, presentations, or other formats.

5. Governance/Structures

Clear and distinct academic integrity governance or structures are necessary to strengthen the oversight of academic integrity and to support the promotion of integrity.¹² Creating a culture of integrity will be much more difficult without such structures which, at the very basic level, send a signal to institutional members that integrity matters. At a more fundamental level, structures operationalise and institutionalise the promotion of academic integrity. The manifestation of governance and structures will be unique to each institution. Some institutions are successful at promoting integrity through an honour code or modified honour code structure¹³, while others may use committees, faculty bodies, an academic integrity office, an office on quality assurance, a teaching centre, or an ethical conduct office as their structures.

6. Training

To promote academic integrity within public and private higher education institutions, staff and students will need to increase their knowledge of academic integrity through in-person and online modes of delivery and equip themselves with the skills needed to act with integrity. Training can focus specifically on the academic skills students need to avoid integrity breaches in online courses,¹⁴ such as citation, study skills, and time management. Instructors can also receive training on how to prevent cheating in their classrooms as well as on online teaching. However, training can also include a focus on developing ethical decision-making skills in students, staff and faculty. Training can be conducted in-person (e.g., workshops, classrooms, seminars) or online.

¹⁰ Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (5), 839-860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778946>

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R.G., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2014). Teach us how to do it properly! An Australian academic integrity student survey. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39 (7), 1150-1169.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406>

Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30 (4), 391-411. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2007.0024>

¹¹ Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (5), 839-860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778946>

¹² Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (5), 839-860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778946>

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R.G., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2014). Teach us how to do it properly! An Australian academic integrity student survey. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39 (7), 1150-1169.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406>

McCabe, D. & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 32 (5), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380009605738>

¹³ McCabe, D. & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 32 (5), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380009605738>

¹⁴ Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R.G., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2014). Teach us how to do it properly! An Australian academic integrity student survey. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39 (7), 1150-1169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406>

V. WHO CAN APPLY?

- a) Public and private higher education institutions recognised as belonging to the education system of one of the 50 States parties to the European Cultural Convention: **Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.**
- b) Student unions associated with higher education institutions of the States parties to the European Cultural Convention.

VI. HOW TO APPLY?

Applications may be submitted in English or French. Complete the **Application Form** (See Appendix 1) and attach any additional documents supporting your application (e.g., evaluation report on the impact of your good practice). Send these documents in electronic form (Word and/or PDF) to the following e-mail address: etined@coe.int. Emails should contain the following reference in subject: **“Call for Best Practices in Promoting Academic Integrity during COVID-19”**. Applications must be received **before 20 August 2021 (at 23:59 CEST)**

Should you wish to nominate more than one practice, a separate application form needs to be submitted for each practice.

Applications received after the above-mentioned date will not be considered.

Questions

Questions regarding this specific call shall be sent at the latest one week before the deadline for the submission exclusively sent to the following address only: etined@coe.int with the following included in the subject: **QUESTIONS - Call for Best Practices in Promoting Academic Integrity during COVID-19.**

VII. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURE

The applications/practices will be evaluated by a panel of experts appointed by the Programme Steering Committee.

Criteria for evaluating best practices

The award criteria apply to all nominated practices irrespective of the category.

The Best Practices Programme is a celebration of good practices, rather than a competition. Thus, any practice, regardless of the category, that meets at least 4 of the following 6 criteria (with one criterion being replicability) is eligible to be recognised.

Stakeholder Participation

Does the practice involve the appropriate stakeholders in the design, implementation or maintenance of the practice? For example, are faculty members and students involved in executing the process, making decisions about policy, providing governance over academic integrity, or helping to deliver messages

about integrity to the community to a maximum degree possible, given the restrictions in place created by the COVID-19 pandemic? Are librarians, writing instructors, tutors, and other academic support staff included in the design and/or implementation of the practice? How does the practice relate to the local community?

Effectiveness

Is there evidence of an initial demonstrable and tangible positive impact of the practice? The evidence could be quantitative or qualitative. For example, if the process and policy were amended, quantitative evidence of effectiveness might be more clicks on a policy webpage, continued reporting of integrity violations during the distance teaching and learning etc. If a communication practice was implemented, qualitative evidence of effectiveness might be that students have a better understanding of academic integrity in online teaching, learning and assessments. Measures of effectiveness can be collected through surveys, focus groups, and/or actual behavioural changes.

Replicable

Does the practice appear to be replicable to other cultures, countries, and higher education institutions because the “key success factors” are “generalisable to other settings”¹⁵? Key success factors might include: solid research/theory undergirding the practice, the mission of the practice is not locally bound, but connected more broadly to the global academic integrity movement, the practice is advocated and supported by a third-party (e.g., International Centre for Academic Integrity), and the people experienced with the practice are available and willing to share and consult with others who would like to implement it.¹⁶

Values-Based

Is there evidence that the 6 fundamental values of academic integrity – honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage (International Centre for Academic Integrity, 2014) – underpin the practice and guide its implementation? For example, does the practice uphold fairness and maintain respect and dignity for those involved, even those who might have breached integrity? Is the practice responsible for ensuring vulnerable groups (e.g., international students) are not targeted or exploited?

Efficient

Is the practice relatively cost-effective to implement and maintain? If cost-effectiveness is difficult to demonstrate, is there an avoidance of waste, minimisation of cost, or good use of local resources?¹⁷ Is the ratio of cost to percentage of population reached efficient?

Sustainable

Best practices are those that remain flexible and responsive to the local context, while still persevering over time.¹⁸ Practices that persevere are those that have been codified or standardised to happen regularly and with expectation. To be sustainable, the practice also has to be sufficiently supported in terms of resources to ensure its continual execution. Practices have an increased chance of being sustained if they are supported at all levels of the higher education institutions, there is community

¹⁵ Ng, E. & de Colombani, P. (2015). Framework for selecting best practices in public health: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Public Health Research*, 4 (#), <https://doi.org/10.4081/jphr.2015.577>

¹⁶ Center for Community Health and Development. (2017). Chapter 19, Section 1: Criteria for choosing promising practices and community interventions. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas. Retrieved February 17th 2020 from the Community Tool Box: <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/analyze/choose-and-adapt-community-interventions/criteria-for-choosing/main>

¹⁷ Ng, E. & de Colombani, P. (2015). Framework for selecting best practices in public health: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Public Health Research*, 4 (#), <https://doi.org/10.4081/jphr.2015.577>

¹⁸ Center for Community Health and Development. (2017). Chapter 19, Section 1: Criteria for choosing promising practices and community interventions. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas. Retrieved February 17th 2020 from the Community Tool Box: <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/analyze/choose-and-adapt-community-interventions/criteria-for-choosing/main>

participation, and programme evaluation.¹⁹

VIII. INDICATIVE TIMETABLE

Phases	Tentative timing
Publication of the call	28 April 2021
Deadline for submitting applications	20 August 2021
Award ceremony	November - December 2021
Dissemination of all practices to other higher education institutions	December 2021 – January 2022

¹⁹ Ibid.