Beyond the web tutorial: Development and Implementation of an online, self-directed academic integrity course at Oakland University

On any university campus in these days of information overload a casual investigator is bound to find plentiful examples of both intentional and unintentional plagiarism. Students do not arrive with the skillset needed for academic research and writing, a deficit that inevitably causes stress and leads to ill-conceived measures of last resort, such as copying and pasting. Libraries have been at the forefront of addressing these issues for generations, and continue to innovate ways to guide students through the process of extracting, processing, and integrating information sources into research projects. At Oakland University, a web-based tutorial on plagiarism created by the library faculty was increasingly adopted into course curriculum as well as the Writing Center's Cite Right plagiarism response program. As a result of increased reliance on the tutorial, the library found that it no longer addressed the needs of the campus community. An analysis of the tutorial's gaps revealed that a considerable amount of content needed to be added, taking the project beyond the scope of what has traditionally been accomplished through such media.

Plagiarism on Campus, and Why is it the Library's Problem?

Across the literature of academe a similar lament occurs: plagiarism is a problem. Although history provides numerous examples of academic dishonesty, the onset of the information age has exacerbated the problem. With digital natives accustomed to constantly sharing and relaying information in their informal social lives, the transition to the staid, formal writing of scholarship provides many challenges, and often many missed opportunities on the part of educators.[1] The traditional approach to plagiarism has been to catch students in the act, most recently with detection software, and bring the swift arm of university justice on to their permanent records. This approach lacks substance, however; it promotes to students the idea that they must strive ever harder to avoid detection, not learn why the authorities have made this such an issue in the first place. Without a foundation of knowledge, formed by clear and supportive information literacy instruction, we are failing our students and promoting the continuance of a culture wherein students do just enough work to ensure they are (at least perceived to be) within the ethical standards of their schools.

The literature is beginning to reflect this very different zeitgeist, with librarians and faculty sounding out to each other and to administrations to approach plagiarism not punitively, but rather as a call to action and yet another justification for the information professional's skill set at the university. Do not punish, it is exhorted, but rather perpetrate knowledge. Educate, inform, equip students with the skills to enter into the ongoing discourse about what it means to be a scholar and what it is to participate properly in the scholarly community. Librarians, due to their work across disciplines building information literacy skills, provide a natural starting point for this dialogue. Park et al. elucidate the seemingly obvious conclusion that:

> Any type of learning that challenges a student's foundational perspectives produces anxiety. If some students commit increased citation errors due to library anxiety or anxiety about appropriately referencing library sources, it seems logical that libraries develop instructional materials that will help students improve their citation skills, thus reducing this anxiety. While discussing the research process in both general education and upper level courses, librarians can reduce anxiety by providing instruction in the correct citation of the resources that are located.[2]

As Gail Wood, Director of SUNY Cortland Libraries, exhorts: "We need to bridge that disparity of definitions and attitudes so that honest students can function in a world of scholarship and ideas, and we must help them to be successful in the academic world and in the profession of their choice."[3] Wiebe also emphasizes the librarian as proactive educator in his article, stressing again that the punitive measures that have been employed on most campuses do nothing to address the real problem. At his institution, Hope College, students were directed during their first-year information literacy sessions to search for articles discussing plagiarism avoidance. Weibe notes that it "allows for a convenient and seamless transition to a dialogue about plagiarism and how it directly concerns them."[4]

Germek supplies librarians with a five-step process of attack, emphasizing educational strategies that focus on prevention and knowledge growth instead of after-the-fact investigative and punitive measures. This strategy will not only overcome what he deems the "vague plagiarism prevention language" of the ACRL standards, but also the alarming growing cultural acceptance of such behaviors, on and off university campuses.[5] His point that "plagiarism is the least discussed component of information literacy" rings painfully true; often the focus for librarians lies in access and research skill issues, and instruction on how to ethically utilize resources is shoved to the end of the class, or left for the non-library faculty to address.[6] As Howard and Davies point out, however, faculty members in the classroom setting rarely do an adequate job either.[7] Park et al. note that an increasing amount of reference questions are citation-related, and come not just from ill-prepared undergraduates: "Faculty and students often look to librarians for guidance in developing citations for electronic sources, which are not clearly delineated in style manuals."[8]

The skill of paraphrasing stood out in the literature as the most-frequently cited problem for students. Pamela A. Jackson's study of an online plagiarism-avoidance tutorial at San Diego State University revealed that students there lacked even the most basic understanding of paraphrasing and its proper use, and she emphasized that more needs to be done to educate and ensure that students are applying the learning objectives correctly.[9] In their analysis of the results of an empirical study on plagiarism avoidance instruction effectiveness, Soto et al. found that "All students who plagiarized had problems with proper paraphrasing, especially when they listed a series of scientific facts."[10] The students employed instead a form of patch-writing,[11] weaving in original material with their own, with no obvious statement or indicator of the source materials. Gail Wood also specifically mentioned paraphrasing as one of the crucial skills that most confounded students.[12] Clearly undergraduates need focused, practical assistance and hands-on experience with developing their paraphrasing techniques.

Bronshteyn and Baladad present the results of an impressive assessment undertaking in which research papers from every outgoing student at Rasmussen College were analyzed for two years in order to ascertain the effectiveness of information literacy skill building.[13] They note that the skillset required for paraphrasing is not just essential to plagiarism avoidance but also must be viewed as an essential step in achieving academic writing success, as it promotes critical thinking skills necessary to effective composition. It is also a crucial component of information literacy in general: "Understanding and mastering the basic concepts of paraphrasing is key to evaluating and effectively using resources, two key tenets of information literacy."[14] The authors stress that incorporating short, fifteen-minute paraphrasing exercises into information literacy workshops or classroom sessions has a noticeable effect on student performance; the students use what they learn and get feedback from librarians on their attempts at paraphrasing.

While such exercises are demonstrably effective, it is a much-lamented refrain among librarians in academe that there simply is not enough time to teach comprehensive information literacy skills in one-shot sessions. Online tutorials, then, typically must suffice. This seems to be the approach that a majority of libraries are taking, with several studies mentioning the creation of online tutorials in one form or another. Oldham describes a tutorial similar to Oakland's created at the University of Scranton, accessible to students via their portal. The tutorial takes students through six modules that present information regarding various facets of academic integrity, and because students must log on to go through the tutorial, faculty are able to monitor who has taken it and how each student fared on the content.[1] Although the tutorial incorporates active learning in the form of multiple-choice questions on the material, there is no hands-on application of the content for the students. Oldham notes that future plans for the tutorial include "the creation of customized tutorials that will reflect the language of the various disciplines."[15]

The Library is not an Island unto Itself: Collaborations across Campuses

In addition to using both face-to-face and online methods of plagiarism instruction, libraries can explore with other university departments multidisciplinary approaches to teaching and preventing plagiarism. One unmistakable choice for collaboration is the university writing center as it inherently shares related goals, responsibilities, and challenges as libraries in the academic environment.[16] Cooke and Bledsoe propose that libraries and writing centers share five common values, including mentoring students in research and writing, interpreting assignment requirements, and, of particular importance, source evaluation and preventing plagiarism.[17] In addition, Elmborg suggests both are early adopters of technologies to enhance services and often hold similar status in the eyes of the institution.[18] He argues that libraries and writing centers face immediate real world problems, often providing high-level services to anxious and hasty students simply seeking a perfect end product. To this end, he maintains that writing centers and libraries can join forces in making research and writing a seamless, holistic process for their users, with particular emphasis on the process rather than the product.[19]

The collaboration of writing centers and libraries, though not a new concept, has only recently emerged in the literature within the last decade. Several independent case studies have been published reflecting on projects involving libraries and writing centers. The nature of collaborations between these two units is quite varied from simply linking to one another's webpages,[20] providing cross-training,[21] and developing spaces for service sharing, such as the Research and Writing Clinics at Bowling Green State University.[22] Of these methods, cross-training appears most in the literature, in which librarians typically instruct writing center tutors on identifying resources,[23] database search strategies,[24] evaluating resources,[25] and source citation.[26] Interestingly, plagiarism instruction was often ignored in tutor training sessions, only emerging as a specific topic in the study by Donna Fontanarose Rabuck et al.[27] Indeed, in the Cannon and Jarson study, tutor instruction at the Trexler Library at Muhlenberg College purposely deemphasizes plagiarism, focusing instead on teaching four citation styles as a method of encouraging academic integrity.[28]

Despite the fair number of case studies reflecting on library-writing center collaborations there is little in the literature to suggest these collaborations have moved to the online environment. As such, there is a grand opportunity for libraries and writing centers to do more online than simply linking to each other's

websites. On-the-ground partnerships between these two units encourage a number of positive outcomes, including increasing visibility in the university community,[29] unifying the research and writing process for the end user,[30] and increasing student academic success.[31] All of these outcomes may be exemplified in the online environment to empower students to pursue lifelong learning.

Academic Integrity Interventions at Oakland University: A Timeline

Oakland University faculty members have long relied on librarians to assist in developing academic integrity. The library's formal intervention began when the first librarian served on the University Senate Academic Conduct Committee, which has as its charge to "review, propose, and implement policies concerning academic dishonesty."[32] The importance of the committee's mandate and the librarian's role grew in recent years as the number of cases involving academic misconduct has risen; while there were twelve reported cases of academic dishonesty in 1997, the committee adjudicated 105 cases in 2011.

As the shift from print to electronic sources created ever increasing problems regarding attribution and documentation, the university responded in 2001 by subscribing to Turnitin.com, an academic software tool developed by University of California-Berkeley graduate students to detect "unoriginal" and/or "unattributed" writing in student papers. Never widely adopted, the software license was discontinued on campus in 2008.

Across campus through the early 2000s, library faculty presented information about plagiarism and its assessment. Early webpages from the library addressed a faculty audience, including sample student integrity statements for course syllabi. Late in 2006, the first iteration of an online plagiarism tutorial, developed by a librarian in concert with the writing center director, was added. This web-based tutorial overviewed academic integrity, defined plagiarism, clarified how and when to cite, and offered instruction on how to quote and paraphrase. Additionally, it featured a ten question quiz and provided students with a certificate of completion if they answered eight of the ten questions correctly.

Just as the library was playing an increasing role in anti-plagiarism efforts, the writing center was reevaluating its intervention role. In 2007, the Dean of Students started informally directing students sanctioned for academic dishonesty to the writing center. There was no formal protocol for how such cases were handled. In most cases, students were asked to complete the online plagiarism tutorial and practice paraphrasing with the consultant until they demonstrated some degree of proficiency.

In response to increasing cases of academic dishonesty and because the informal referral process became less effective, the writing center developed Cite Right in 2009, a formal intervention program of seven sessions. At this time, consultants approached the problem text as evidence of a skills deficit rather than as demonstration of a conscious choice to cheat. This approach was used for about a year until a writing consultant approached the director about disconcerting student attitudes toward plagiarism. He and his colleagues found that many students not only "owned" their cheating but were often unrepentant and unmotivated by the low-stakes consequences for their academic dishonesty. With the director's blessing, the student redesigned the program to foreground a discussion about the culture of plagiarism and created mandatory reading assignments, reflective essays, and a new research assignment about the topic of academic integrity itself. In its new format, students must pass a quiz that calls upon them to demonstrate their emergent paraphrasing and attribution skills and participate in an exit interview after completing the mandatory modules.

In 2011 an ad hoc task force formed to address the increasing role of the library's tutorial on academic integrity training and remediation across campus. Among the decisions made by the group was to situate the new content within the university's learning management system instead of a publicly accessible webpage. The many enhancements to the previous content include discrete modules on such skills as academic ethics and using and citing sources, as well as practical examples of learning objectives and ample opportunity for active learning. Most importantly, in the practice unit, students are given a discipline-specific and style-specific example where paraphrasing and attribution are necessary. Then they are asked to use that example as a model for their own paraphrase on the same topic. The many departures, both pedagogical and technical, from the previous tutorial created something that presents far more than a typical tutorial, becoming instead a learning object that both looks and feels much more like a standalone online course.

Development of Learning Outcomes

The main objective of the new course, *Using and Citing Sources*, is to motivate students to use sources wisely and effectively, and above all to develop the skills for lifelong learning. Motivating students implies avoiding the "policing" approach and favoring prevention, as mentioned above. The policing approach to plagiarism prevention typically begins at the university administrative level with honor codes, which, as Susan Blum points out, is a traditional "top-down" strategy that has proven ineffective. Blum notes that a better approach is premised on the fact that the proper use of citations is a set of skills that can and should be taught.[33]

Using and Citing Sources is used extensively on campus, as instructors require students to take and pass it for their classes. It targets unintentional plagiarism as much as intentional by providing a foundation for students to begin understanding why and how sources should be read, analyzed and synthesized and how the resulting information should be incorporated in their own work.

When designing the new course objectives, the plagiarism task force team relied on the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards. With issues of academic integrity and plagiarism, it is common to refer to Standard 5, which deals with the ethical aspects of information use. This standard emphasizes following rules and regulations, using language such as: "The information literate student follows laws, regulations, institutional policies, and etiquette related to the access and use of information resources."[34] This standard includes the outcome that the student "Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and does not represent work attributable to others as his/her own."[35] Performance Indicator 3 is also often cited: "The information literate student acknowledges the use of information sources in communicating the product or performance."[36] Because of the perceived limitations of the punitive focus of those standards, the task force also incorporated Standard 3, which includes summarizing, analysis and synthesis skills: "The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system."[37] Also of use to content development was Standard 4, Performance Indicator 1, which relates to the integration of new information into a product, such as a research paper.[38]

The Citation Project, an ongoing writing and plagiarism research project with several university stakeholders, provided additional inspiration, giving valuable insight into the ways students write from sources.[39] The study found that most students did not summarize or even paraphrase but used direct quotations and patch-writing, which suggests that students either did not understand the sources they used

or did not entirely read and interpret them appropriately. As the authors point out, "these students are not writing from sources; they are writing from sentences selected from sources."[40]

The task force leader then put together a draft of the learning outcomes for the team to examine. It was decided that the structure of the course would match those learning outcomes. From the original draft, the list of learning outcomes was streamlined to emphasize the amount that could be taught in a forty-five minute tutorial (Table 1).

Table 1: Course Learning Outcomes

Course Development and Implementation

Course Content

Based on the developed learning outcomes, the task force set out to develop a course consisting of six distinct modules: (1) academic integrity and plagiarism, (2) how and when to use sources, (3) paraphrasing, (4) direct quotes, (5) citation styles, and (6) putting it all together. Additionally, the course had to culminate in the issuing of a certificate of completion in order to provide continuity and consistency with existing practice on campus at the time.[41] The first module on academic integrity and plagiarism introduces these concepts and their local implementation on campus, including the consequences for plagiarism. To make this potentially dry content palatable and engaging, a publicly-available plagiarism video using a theft metaphor was embedded. The video adds a personal and emotional dimension to the concept of plagiarism by illustrating a conversation between two friends, one of whom has plagiarized from the other. An additional technique to minimize the potentially punitive tone of the content is included in a question-and-answer page, from a student's point of view, which dispels some key misconceptions. The opportunity for active learning through immediate application of the concepts consists of a text passage that requires students to make a determination of whether the example constitutes plagiarism or not.

The second module on how and when to use sources focuses on scholarly communication. It explains the mechanics of how authors reference outside texts within their own work. To provide visual illustrations to the explanations, the module includes a color-coded image of a text passage accompanied by a matching flow chart that maps the scholarly conversation in the passage (Figure 1). The module also establishes some of the main reasons for using outside texts, including to establish one's credibility, to add evidence or facts that are not widely known, and to incorporate existing and/or controversial theories and interpretations. The active learning opportunities in this module include examining the use of external sources within two texts in order to determine the role of the external sources, as well as multiple activities that ask students to decide if the use of various snippets of information (e.g. that might represent common knowledge or not) or manners of use (e.g. direct quotes or summaries) necessitate documentation in their own work.

Figure 1: Example of how a scholar uses sources

The third module discusses paraphrasing. It introduces the differences among quoting, paraphrasing and summarizing, then proceeds to highlight best practices in successful paraphrasing, providing very specific

examples from different disciplines. Writing center student employees contributed to this section based on the recommendations they typically make to students, giving the content an additional element of realism. In explaining how best to paraphrase, for instance, this module illustrates the processes if 1) students are working with the original text or 2) their strategy is to create the paraphrase from memory without looking at the original text. Additionally, students may choose among disciplines so they are exposed to examples most relevant to their chosen majors. Options given include behavioral sciences, biomedical sciences, education, humanities, and undeclared. Each example includes an original text passage with an accompanying sample of good paraphrasing and annotations highlighting those characteristics that make the paraphrase effective.

In an early iteration of the course, the task force had grouped the modules on paraphrasing and direct quotes into one entity that focused on using sources, but this was deemed too long. The team split the two modules, creating a brief module on the use of direct quotes. This fourth module introduces the main reasons for choosing to quote someone's exact words, such as a unique or original statement, vivid language, or controversial material. It covers the role of direct quotes and offers activities that allow students an opportunity to decide what reasoning justifies the use of a sample direct quote. In each of the two activities, the students are presented with a passage which utilizes a direct quote from an outside source. They need to determine the rhetorical role of that direct quote. Several options are presented in multiple-choice format to help them think through the possibilities and evaluate the passage with those options in mind.

The fifth module focuses on citation styles, introducing the concept of a citation and explaining the role of citation styles. Then, students may branch off into one of four directions to get instructional content on a citation style of their choice: APA, MLA, Chicago or AMA. Each branch presents students with a combination of video tutorials and examples within that chosen citation style; for instance, the content on APA introduces the style and includes an embedded video from the publishers of the style manual. Students are then exposed to an example in the form of a PDF article with highlights and explanations drawing their attention to the specifics of APA in-text citations. Two active learning exercises encourage students to apply the information they have just encountered: they are asked to answer a question about the purpose of style manuals and to evaluate if a reference is correctly formatted in APA style. The other three citation styles are treated in a similar manner, offering video tutorials, an analysis of in-text practices, and activities to engage the students in applying the new information.

The sixth and final module, entitled "Putting It All Together", does not offer any new instructional content. Rather, it presents an opportunity for students to practice the use of outside sources through paraphrasing and through the correct application of a relevant citation style, two skills that both the literature and classroom experience reveal are critical need areas. To make the activity most meaningful to students with a specific major, they are presented with the same discipline-based options as in the earlier module on paraphrasing. Each subject example includes independent instructions, allowing students to continue with one subject or choose another. For each discipline, the sixth module presents a sample text passage taken from the same article that was included as part of the paraphrasing example. Students are then asked to write their own paragraph using information from that passage as well as their own background knowledge or experiences. The instructions direct them to incorporate information by paraphrasing and using a specified citation style. Links to the relevant citation style guides online are included here so students may get practice in consulting those while composing their own text.

Finally, the course offers a certificate of completion because many courses on campus already required the completion of the previous, briefer plagiarism tutorial. For continuity and a smooth transition to the new expanded course the task force developed an equivalent certificate that students could either print or electronically submit to their professors. To that end, the group designed a ten-question quiz that results in a certificate webpage if at least eight of the ten questions have been answered correctly. The certificate webpage displays the student's name and score on the plagiarism quiz. It includes a permanent URL that may be used for electronic submission, while printing accommodates paper-based submissions that might be required by faculty. Visually the certificate is different from the one attached to the previous plagiarism tutorial in order to alert faculty that something has changed. Also, the team decided to include a brief explanation in the footer that the plagiarism tutorial has been revised and expanded, accompanied by the contact information of a librarian who can answer any questions or verify specific certificates. The library keeps a database of each certificate with its unique number, student name, and responses to quiz questions to be able to verify certificates and to internally assess the new plagiarism tutorial by analyzing student performance on specific questions.

Use of the campus Learning Management System (LMS)

The pedagogical benefits of active learning exercises led the task force to consider venues for delivery of the course content that would allow for the most interactivity. The task force wanted to ensure that the choice of platform offered easy editing of the content as well as sufficient and secure tracking of student performance, because the course serves the needs of two distinct student groups.   Most students who encounter the course are required to complete it for one or more of their courses and to submit a certificate of completion to each professor who uses it as a required assignment; however, students who have committed an academic conduct violation might be required to go through the course before meeting with writing center consultants to work on issues of plagiarism.

In order to accommodate the different student groups, the task force selected the campus learning management system, Moodle. The system's 'lesson' functionality, giving a sequence of pages that students follow in a predetermined order, was most suitable for the content of the course. Multiple lessons may be made dependent on one another to ensure that students complete all of them in a specific order. For lesson pages that include questions, both correct and incorrect answers generate a feedback page that reinforces the content. Offering detailed explanations and modeling the rationale for each answer turns the feedback loop into yet another teachable moment and reinforces the instructional content. Figures 2 and 3 illustrate a sample question based page followed by the feedback page for one of the wrong answers.

Figure 2: Sample Question-Based Page

Figure 3: Sample Feedback Page

The branching option in Moodle provided another useful component, providing alternative content to students by allowing them to select one relevant path. As mentioned previously, branching was used to include content on multiple citation styles to allow students to experience the course branch for one citation style of their choosing. While the task force could have exposed students to a pre-determined commonly-used citation style, it was agreed that having alternatives best served the needs of the campus student population. Medical students, for instance, may choose to go through the AMA citation style without the possible confusion of learning how everything is handled in APA. The modules on paraphrasing and the final module that allowed students to put all of their newly-gained knowledge to practical use also benefitted from the branching feature. Since both of these modules involve working with excerpts from the literature, students are offered several choices in order to expose them to text and activities that might better transfer to their potential majors.

One of the key benefits of using the campus LMS is the ability to track student performance on all active learning exercises. Oakland University has one instance of the LMS that is populated with courses for each semester and one instance that could be used for more permanent course-like content. The plagiarism course resides in the second, more permanent instance, meaning it does not need to be imported every semester. Students auto-enroll in the course when they first log in and their performance on all activities remains there for multiple semesters (until deleted by any of the course administrators). The writing center consultants have instructor privileges in the course and are able to access students' performance on activities as well as the text of their paragraphs in the final module. This allows them to customize their sessions with students who are required to work on plagiarism-related issues due to an academic violation. Moreover, having student performance data on all of the activities will allow the task force to analyze key areas of difficulty and revise accordingly. At the same time, the library does not need to take extra steps to secure the student performance data because it is stored in a campus-wide system in the same manner as all other student performance for credit-based courses. This efficiency, coupled with the familiar login for students, made the LMS an easy and practical choice.

The course authors benefitted tremendously from working with a system that was designed to enable e-learning: it allowed the focus to be on content, rather than trying to design each possible interaction. The interactive functionality of adding questions and activities is native to the LMS and the authors need only fill in the content through a web-based interface. As a result, the final course has more activities than would have been feasible if it had required full coding of each interaction in a public webpage. Moreover, the utilization of a system that all colleagues are familiar with makes the long-term maintenance of the tutorial content much more practical, since it does not depend on the skills of one specific librarian. The ability to make each module dependent on the completion of a previous one was also trivial to implement by comparison to the cookie-based approach that had been used in the previous plagiarism tutorial.

In terms of limitations, the choice of an LMS introduced two potential concerns for the task force: the course content cannot be truly public, and the LMS is not able to produce a certificate that can submitted to faculty outside of the system. Even though the system allows for guest access, the need for a login cannot be avoided. After careful discussion of the consequences of these limitations, the task force agreed that serving the needs of the campus population and the ability to collect performance data for students required to complete the course justified the reduced public access. As for the certificate, while faculty can added to the course to access the scores of their students, they must be added individually and browse the list of all students taking the course, not just their own students. As a result, an external solution for

the certificate had to be found. A webpage was created in the LMS that presents the quiz questions to students without using the internal quiz functionality. Instead a script on the library website externally processes the quiz and the certificate is dynamically generated. A Microsoft Access database stores quiz and certificate data, so that certificates may be verified whenever questions about their authenticity arise and we are able to analyze quiz responses for internal assessment of the overall effectiveness of the course.

Analysis and Recommendations

The online course *Using and Citing Sources* launched in January 2012, about a year after the task force first met to develop a strategic plan for improving the previous tutorial. Within the first four months of launching, 1650 students logged in and successfully completed the course (a total of 3330 attempts were made, which attests to the value that faculty place on the course: it is important to students to get the maximum points). The numbers confirm the need for such a course, illustrating the increasing reliance of the university faculty on library instructional tools to develop academic integrity among students.

As with any project, a number of successes and challenges emerged during the development, testing, and implementation phases of the course; however, this discussion will focus on a few key best practices and lessons learned. Overall, a number of elements contributed to the success of this project: 1) multidisciplinary nature of the task force; 2) use of the learning management system to host the course; and 3) incorporation of active learning components within the course, including means of assessment. The course additionally enhances our presence throughout campus in regard to promotion of student retention and our instructional mission.

The multidisciplinary nature of the project not only in the membership of the task force, but also in the testing phase greatly enhanced the online course. The task force was comprised of the director of the writing center and six librarians with expertise in a variety of fields. As a result, the structure of the literature and expectations of scholarly work in each major discipline was incorporated into the paraphrasing and citation style sections modules of the course. In addition, collaboration with members of the writing center allowed the course to be customized to address problems often seen in student writing, including paraphrasing, use of quotations, and the proper citing of sources. In particular, the writing center developed the format of paraphrasing examples found in the course based on student tutoring experiences, highlighting issues frequently found in student work.

The use of the learning management system facilitated greater flexibility and time management in the development of the course. In the case of the previous tutorial, the team relied on one librarian to develop, design, and integrate content, as it required expertise with both Flash and Cold Fusion. In the new course, because all team members were familiar with the structure of the LMS and it required no special programming knowledge, content could be created and edited by all members, evenly distributing tasks and time to each member.

Finally, the structure and nature of the LMS allowed for easy integration of active learning tasks. Each section of the course includes a number of active learning activities and as a result students are continuously being asked to recall and reflect on what they've learned. In addition, although the final quiz was developed outside the LMS, the course continues to provide a means of assessment for faculty who used the previous tutorial as an assignment in their courses.

The project proved to be a continual learning process for the task force. One of the initial challenges, for example, was to decide on the order in which the modules would be introduced within the course. What elements did the students need to learn first in order to build their skill set? At what point should citation styles be introduced? In a sense, familiarity with styles is a prerequisite to the practice of paraphrase and direct quotation. It is more important that students understand the proper utilization of paraphrasing before they learn the mechanics of citation styles. Another challenge revealed itself during informal testing of the draft course: students were uncertain as to where they were in the course at any given time, leading to the inclusion of visual progress bars throughout each module.

The task force plans to continually update and evolve the *Using and Citing Sources* course as technology and user needs change. Future projects include analyzing the data collected from the course over a long period of time to detect trends and challenges as well as gather faculty feedback to improve the course. Initial response from faculty has been overwhelmingly positive, with many requiring their students to take the course; there have also been requests to develop other tutorials into similar courses based on this model. As a teaching library, with credit-based course offerings within the general education matrix, it is also possible that future iterations of the course may be further developed into part of a larger, official course offering on academic integrity and research.

---

[1] Susan D. Blum, *My Word! Plagiarism and College Culture* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2009): 29-59.

[2] Sarah Park, Lori A. Mardis and Conny Jo Ury. "I've lost my identity – oh, there it is . . . in a style manual: Teaching citation styles and academic honesty." *Reference Services Review* 39 (2011): 46.

[3] Gail Wood, "Academic Original Sin: Plagiarism, the Internet, and Librarians," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30 (May 2004): 238.

[4] Todd J. Wiebe, "College Students, Plagiarism, and the Internet: The Role of Academic Librarians in Delivering Education and Awareness", *MLA Forum* 5 (December 2006): 6.

[5] George P. Germek, "Imagine No Possessions: Librarians, the Net-Generation Student, and the Imminent Victory of Plagiarism", *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 16 (2009): 342.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Rebecca Moore Howard & Laura J. Davies, "Plagiarism in the Internet age", *Educational Leadership* 66 (March 2009): 64-67.

[8] Park et al, "I've lost my identity", 54.

[9] Pamela A. Jackson, "Plagiarism instruction online: Assessing undergraduate students' ability to avoid plagiarism", *College & Research Libraries* 67 (September 2006): 418-28.

[10] Julio G. Soto, Sulekha Anand & Elizabeth McGee, "Plagiarism Avoidance: An Empirical Study Examining Teaching Strategies", *Journal of College Science Teaching* 33 (July/August 2004): 46.

[11] A term first coined by Rebecca Howard but adopted by scholars with increasing frequency to describe the hybrid writing style common from today's students. Rebecca M. Howard, "A plagiarism pentimento", *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(1993): 233-246. Blum, in *My Word!,* attributes the rise of this writing style to the practice of sharing promulgated by social media.

[12] Wood, "Academic Original Sin", 238.

[13] Karen Bronshteyn and Rita Baladad, "Librarians as Writing Instructors: Using Paraphrasing Exercises to Teach Beginning Information Literacy Students", *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32 (September 2006): 533-536.

[14] Ibid., 534.

[15] Bonnie Oldham, "Impact of an Online Library Tutorial on Student Understanding of Academic Integrity", *Catholic Library World* 82 (September 2011): 31.

[16] Rachel Cooke and Carol Bledsoe, "Writing Centers and Libraries: One-Stop Shopping for Better Term Papers," *Reference Librarian* 49 (2008): 119-120, doi: 10.1080/02763870802101310; James K. Elmborg, "Libraries and Writing Centers in Collaboration: A Basis in Theory," in *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration,* eds. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook. (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2005), 1.

[17] Cooke and Bledsoe, "Writing Centers and Libraries: One-Stop Shopping for Better Term Papers," 120.

[18] Elmborg, "Libraries and Writing Centers in Collaboration: A Basis in Theory," 5.

[19] Ibid., 7-11.

[20] Cooke and Bledsoe, "Writing Centers and Libraries: One-Stop Shopping for Better Term Papers," 120; Jennifer H. Solomon "University Writing Center and Library Collaborations: An Analysis of Writing Center and Library Websites at ARL Affiliated Institutions" (Master diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2008).

[21] Colleen Boff and Barbara Toth, "Better-Connected Student Learning: Research and Writing Project Clinics at Bowling Green State University," in *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration,* eds. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook. (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2005), 148-157.; Cannon and Jarson 2009; Fontanarose Rabuck et al. 2005

[22] Boff and Toth 2005; Lea and Lowe 2004, 136-137

[23] Boff and Toth 2005, 153; Cannon and Jarson 2009, 47; Fontanarose Rabuck et al. 2005, 170; Lea and Lowe 2004, 136

[24] Boff and Toth 2005, 153; Cannon and Jarson 2009, 47; Fontanarose Rabuck et al. 2005, 170; Lea and Lowe 2004, 136

[25] Cannon and Jarson 2009, 47

[26] Ibid.

[27] Fontanarose Rabuck et al. 2005, 170

[28] Cannon and Jarson 2009, 47

[29] Giglio and Strickland 2005, 138

[30] Cannon and Jarson 2009, 53; Elmborg 2005, 11; Giglio and Strickland 2005, 145

[31] Cooke and Bledsoe 2008, 126

[32] Oakland University Senate Committee Charges (2012). Online. Available: http://www.oakland.edu/?id=7570&sid=230#conduct

[33] Susan D. Blum, "Academic Integrity and Student Plagiarism: a Question of Education, Not Ethics", *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55 (Feb. 20, 2009): A35.

[34] Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (2000): 14. Online. Available: http://www.ala.org/acrl/files/standards/standards.pdf

[35] Ibid., 14.

[36] Ibid., 14.

[37] Ibid., 11.

[38] Ibid., 13.

[39] Rebecca Moore Howard, Tanya K. Rodrigue, and Tricia C. Serviss, "Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences" *Writing and Pedagogy* 2.2 (Fall 2010): 177-192. Also see the website for The Citation Project, available at http://site.citationproject.net.

[40] Howard, Rodrigue, and Serviss, "Writing from Sources," 187.

[41] Access to the course is available at http://library.oakland.edu/tutorials/plagiarism, where you are welcome to log in as a guest, following the instructions on the login page.