



## Correction to Table 1 and accompanying text (submitted March 2018):

**Table 1. Summary of Academic Integrity Violations: The statistics for CHE 205 over the past seven semesters reporting on total enrollment, students caught cheating, and students who admit to the cheating behavior.**

CHE 205 Offering (N = number of students) <sup>1</sup>	Percent of enrolled students who had a reported violation	Percent of students with violations who contested the charges and requested a hearing	Percent of students who requested a hearing and were subsequently found guilty
Fall 2004 (N = 101)	9.90%	30.00%	100%
Fall 2005 (N = 110)	10.00%	18.18%	100%
Fall 2006 (N = 109)	8.26%	0%	N/A
Spring 2007 (N = 49)	4.08%	0%	N/A
Fall 2007 (N = 120)	8.33%	0%	N/A
Fall 2008 (N = 159)	3.77%	0%	N/A
Fall 2009 (N = 173)	10.98%	5.26%	100%
Average Pre-Intervention (Fall '04 – Fall '05)	9.95%	24.1%	100%
Average Post-Intervention (Fall '06 – Fall '09 )	7.09%	1.1%	100%

The data in Table 1 show that once we began to be more intentional about communicating expectations around academic integrity, the incidence of cheating between Fall 2006 – Fall 2008 decreased by an amount that varied between -17% and -62% from one semester to another, with an average decrease of about 39%. (This held true until Fall 2009, when the number of cheating cases increased by -1% above the pre-video figures). All but one of the forty-six<sup>2</sup> students who were caught cheating post-intervention admitted guilt rather than requesting a hearing.

<sup>1</sup>In the original Table 1, the value for student enrollment (“N”) was incorrect for Spring 2007; it should be 49 instead of 76. In checking all the enrollment numbers against the university’s records, we found that several of the other total enrollment numbers (Fall 2004, Fall 2005, Fall 2007, and Fall 2008) varied by a difference of 1-3 students. This is likely due to the fact that our enrollment numbers did not reflect students who dropped the course prior to the withdrawal deadline. These values have been corrected to reflect the university’s official enrollment numbers, and the values for “Percent of Enrolled Students Who Had a Reported Violation” have been adjusted accordingly.

<sup>2</sup>The previous figure of sixty-three students incorrectly included student violations from semesters which are not included in the study.

**Updates to Web Links:**

- We began by making specific [modifications to the course syllabus](#) to outline our expectations and those of the university regarding academic integrity, and we discussed these expectations on the first day of class.
- (The NCSU Office of Student Conduct has an [excellent guide on how to confront a student](#)).
- If a charge is to be filed, the faculty member fills out a [form](#) describing the infraction and the proposed penalty.
- In fall 2009 students completed a [reflection assignment](#) for homework that required them to watch the videos on-line and respond to several short answer questions.
- These are now publicly available through the [NC State Office of Faculty Development web site](#) along with other examples of syllabus language and scenarios used by faculty. A summary of materials has been posted on [Bullard's faculty web site](#). Bullard has also recorded a 90-minute webinar entitled, "[Dealing with Issues of Academic Integrity in the Larger Classroom](#)."
- As a result of discussions with faculty colleagues in the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering at NC State, students were asked to complete a "[reflection assignment](#)" on the topic of academic integrity as the first homework assignment in CHE 205 in Fall 2009.
- The faculty in our department have responded by asking students in all of our classes to sign a form, "[Restriction on Sharing Content of Course Material with Third Parties](#)."