

Fidelity to scholarly practice: Academic honesty and information literacy in the Faculty of Arts

Claire Brooks

Information and Education Services
The University of Melbourne

Jenny Ellis

Information Management
The University of Melbourne

Abstract

Fidelity to the principles and practice of academic practice is a guiding principle underpinning the development of the ArtsSmart suite of online tutorials. ArtsSmart uses educational technology in a creative way to meet a particular educational need: to deliver integrated and student-centred information literacy and academic honesty programs to a broad cohort of first year students from many disciplines across the Faculty of Arts. This fidelity to the development of scholarly practice is accompanied by fidelity to the principle of quality learning. From the start of the project the developers were conscious of the need to ensure that first year students at the University of Melbourne were offered a quality e-learning experience. The tutorial uses purpose built software that allows the program to be customised for diverse disciplines and modes of implementation. This software gives flexibility and also allows for sustainability. ArtsSmart is an online tutorial that supports first year Arts students in learning about, and practising the skills related to academic discourse.

Keywords

academic honesty, plagiarism, information literacy, online, e-learning

Introduction

FIDELITY implies strict and continuing faithfulness to an obligation, trust, or duty (Merriam-Webster online dictionary)

Fidelity to the development of scholarly practice and quality learning is the central principle that underpins the creation and development of the *ArtsSmart* suite of online tutorials for first year students at the University of Melbourne. *ArtsSmart* embodies the recognition that, in their transition to university level studies, first year students need further support if they are to understand the principles of scholarly practice and acquire the practical skills required for research tasks. *ArtsSmart* deals with the topics of academic honesty and plagiarism, citation, copyright and information literacy research and retrieval skills. When taken as a whole, the tutorial introduces first year Arts students to these important aspects of scholarly practice by ensuring that they are equipped with the skills required for scholarly writing and well-conducted research.

This fidelity to the development of scholarly practice is matched by fidelity to the principle of quality learning. From the start of the project we were conscious of the need to ensure that first year students from the University of Melbourne were offered a quality learning experience.

ArtsSmart also aligns closely with the idea of ‘maintaining the momentum’ by ensuring the sustainability of people and resources. *ArtsSmart* is designed to allow maximum flexibility for change and adaptation to meet the changing needs of the University environment. *ArtsSmart* achieves this flexibility through the use of a purpose built software system that can deliver customizable and shareable content in the form of quizzes, HTML pages, videos, opinion polls and graphics supported by online communication tools such as discussion board and chat. This level of customization gives *ArtsSmart* its distinctive character.

These three themes will provide the over-arching structure of this paper, which will investigate in turn:

- i. Fidelity to the development of scholarly practice
- ii. Fidelity to quality learning
- iii. Fidelity to quality learning through the evaluation process
- iv. Maintaining the momentum (sustainability).

i. Fidelity to the development of scholarly practice

“The most important attribute that the University of Melbourne would like to see in its graduates, is a profound respect for truth, and for the ethics of scholarship. The reason why this is so important is that we want our graduates to be capable of independent thought, to be able to do their own work, and to know how to acknowledge the work of others.”

(Professor Peter McPhee, *ArtsSmart*, 2004)

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Peter McPhee, uses these words in his introduction to the Academic Honesty module of *ArtsSmart*. The same sentiments are reiterated in many University documents and they encapsulate a commitment at University-level to the development of scholarly practice as a graduate attribute.

The Faculty of Arts shares this commitment to support and enhance scholarly endeavour and this is demonstrated by the decision to fund the development of *ArtsSmart* through a competitive grants process. *ArtsSmart* received maximum funding from the Faculty of Arts *IT and Multimedia Committee* for development by a collaborative team of educational designers, media specialists and software developers from Courseware Development Services. From the outset it was envisaged that the tutorial would be broadly implemented as a hurdle requirement in specific first year subjects in six departments across the Faculty.

The first two modules of *ArtsSmart* will deal with information literacy while the remaining three modules broadly deal with the ethical use of information. The modules are:

- Preparing for Tutorials: Finding Items on your Reading List
- Finding Research Materials for your Essays and Assignments
- Academic Honesty and Plagiarism
- Citation
- Copyright Matters.

Taken as a whole, the *ArtsSmart* modules demonstrate fidelity to the development of scholarly practice.

The ethical use of information

There is no doubt that the issue of academic honesty and plagiarism is one of the major issues confronting academics and students in higher education today and it is central to ethical scholarly practice. (Harris, 2001; Biggs, 1999; James, McInnis, & Devlin, 2002; Ashworth, Banister, & Thorne, 1997; Mulcahy & Goodacre, 2004; Stoney & McMahon, 2004; Williams, 2002) Many technical solutions have been devised to detect plagiarism with varying degrees of success. (Mulcahy & Goodacre, 2004). *ArtsSmart* attempts to balance this detection punishment approach with a commitment to educate students about the values implicit in academic discourse and the concomitant conventions of academic writing.

The Academic Honesty module of *ArtsSmart* provides examples of different kinds of plagiarism, inviting students to practise their skills in avoiding the traps. It also attempts to explain the way in which academic knowledge is built upon the synthesis and responsible use of shared knowledge, works and ideas, pointing out that plagiarism is inimical to scholarly communication. Significantly it also addresses the emotional and affective domain by enquiring about the values and ideas students have in response to complex ethical dilemmas associated with plagiarism, collusion, cheating, in an information-overloaded environment. Students have opportunities to interact with one another, exploring these issues.

We are not addressing here or in the online tutorial the complex and ever changing relationship between knowledge and ownership of ideas and the marketplace. Rather we accepted the imperative to ensure that students are aware of plagiarism and the importance of academic honesty. We aimed to support learners in their learning tasks — how could they demonstrate the ways in which they selected information, built arguments and presented new and existing information?

A further module is devoted to an examination of copyright from a student perspective. This module is designed to give students a basic understanding of their rights and obligations in this complex area. It is another area that broadly deals with the ethical use of information.

Information literacy

Information literacy has been identified as a key element in the development of research skills for independent learners. The information literacy specialist, Christine Bruce, argues that ‘the significance of information literacy lies in its potential to encourage deep, rather than surface learning, and in its potential to transform dependent learners into independent, self directed, lifelong learners’ (Bruce, 2002).

However, research at the University of Melbourne has convincingly demonstrated that commencing students do not have the most basic foundation library research skills.

During 2002 and 2003, two studies were conducted that investigated the information literacy skills of 680 first year Arts students. These studies found that the great majority of commencing students were unable to successfully perform even the most basic operations. For example only 22% of students were able to demonstrate the knowledge of how to locate a journal article in the Library catalogue. (Ellis & Salisbury, 2004) Based upon this thorough needs analysis, two modules were carefully crafted to build upon prior knowledge and to address identified gaps in student knowledge. These modules are a first step towards acquiring the level of information literacy required for independent research.

ii. Fidelity to quality learning

Fidelity to the practice of sound scholarship is achieved by employing quality learning processes. As Educational Designer and Content Developer, we were very aware of the fact that we were dealing with first year students who were in a transitional phase, and we were therefore cognizant of the need to offer them a quality e-learning experience.

The tutorial uses educational technology in a creative and innovative way to ensure that students acquire these research skills within a meaningful and relevant context where the learning is integrated into the curriculum. *ArtsSmart* is student-centred and based upon the principles of active learning as a means of encouraging student engagement and learning (Biggs, 1999). The modules provide opportunities for learners to explore the social, intellectual and emotional dimensions of the topics and their learning environment. Collaborative work, online communications, opinion polls, pair and group work ensure that transition skills can be learned in a social environment designed to enhance the learning experience for first year students.

In a campus based institution such as the University of Melbourne this tutorial models uses of technology in education and good practice in online teaching and learning strategies to academics who might otherwise not consider using technology. For students it provides an excellent balance to face-to-face methods of delivery and also introduces them to some of the technologies used in the University.

Contextualisation

Although we aimed to teach transferable skills and generic principles to a broad cohort, we were unwilling to create a one-size-fits-all tutorial. Learning information literacy skills is more effective when it is integrated into the curriculum. This is endorsed in University of Melbourne teaching documents that stress the importance of teaching independent learning skills within the context of the students' studies. For example a guide for new university teachers indicates that the 'teaching of skills can never be content-free — it is always conducted in the context of a specific subject' (James & Baldwin, 1997, p. 8).

For these reasons, the *ArtsSmart* modules are firmly situated in the University of Melbourne context. The Academic Honesty tutorial explicitly follows the policy set out on the University Plagiarism website. It refers students to University support groups such as the Language and Learning Skills unit and notes relevant University publications. In the same manner, the information retrieval modules introduce students to the catalogue and database interfaces used at the University of Melbourne.

However *ArtsSmart* can be integrated much more deeply into the curriculum. Our aim was to create a "just-in-time, just-for-you" online tutorial and this required a much greater capacity for integration into the curriculum. This commitment to integration raised educational and technical issues and it is the solution to these problems that gives *ArtsSmart* an innovative edge. The solution was devised using a collaborative multimedia team approach to developing unique solutions to unique problems (Hirst, Brooks, & Riddle, 2004). The multimedia developers created a Content and Authoring Management System (CAMS) that allowed a great degree of customisation in the tutorial (Wesley, Vasjuta, Yau, & Robertson, 2004). CAMS enables *ArtsSmart* to deal with generic skills within the context of the student's actual studies and authentic assessment tasks.

Using this purpose built software we are able to brand each version of the tutorial by department and individual subject. Lecturers can clearly associate the modules with an authentic assessment task by including relevant sample topics and database searches. Students can learn to search the specialist subject databases, and the citation style used throughout will be the style used in that department. We can add subject-specific content and remove material that is not required for a particular assignment or discipline. For example a lecturer can select from a wide range of collaborative exercises, games, quizzes and video clips to support the content of their subject. The content authoring and management system affords an excellent compromise between the generic and the subject-specific tutorial.

Pre-test methodology

As *ArtsSmart* crosses several departments, it is inevitable that some students will be required to complete the tutorial in more than one subject. Although each version of the tutorial includes specialist materials, for the subject, the content overlaps. To address this problem, we adopted a pre-test/post-test methodology for the two information literacy modules. If a student answers the pre-test correctly then they can move to the next section. However, if they answer incorrectly (and they are only given one chance), they are required to proceed to the instructional material. Using this approach students only have to study the areas where it is self-evident that there are gaps in their knowledge.

Interactive learning activities

ArtsSmart learning activities promote active learning, reflecting the premise “what the student does is actually more important in determining what is learned than what the teacher does” (Shuell, as cited in Biggs, 1999, p. v). This focus on active learning was not always easy to achieve. Some of the topics covered in *ArtsSmart*, (especially Academic Honesty and Plagiarism) are very text based and it was a constant challenge to create learning activities that were interactive and engaging.

The interactive activities that encourage engagement with the subject matter and active learning include:

- Quizzes with multiple choice answers.
- Exercises that provide extensive instant feedback and model answers.
- Poll questions that encourage students to reflect upon the issues, offer an opinion and then view a whole class comparison of the results.
- Interactive database simulations where the student follows instructions to proceed through a catalogue or database search.
- Drag and drop, matching, and ordering exercises.

These activities were designed to promote engagement with the subject matter and it was gratifying to find that many students commented favourably on the activities in the evaluations. For example, one student commented that the ‘exercises were engaging, i found it difficult to spot the little things though, i found them challenging’. Another remarked that: ‘The exercises were short and easy to understand and made plagiarism seem very clear.’ The opinion polls also elicited some favourable comment such as the student who wrote that the ‘survey type questions were interesting and it was good to see the most popular answers (a.k.a most common opinions) of my peers.’

Visual elements

ArtsSmart includes activities that support the needs of learners who prefer non-text presentations. Videos feature authentic first year students who provide wonderful non-scripted and natural insights into their own university experience. There is also a video by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Peter McPhee who lends high-level academic support to the project. These videos are accompanied by text versions and the evaluations indicated that these text versions are essential. It is clear that a significant number of students still do not have home internet connections that support loading videos. In future, an audio sound track will support the tutorial. The tutorial is also enlivened by animations that illustrate culturally sensitive issues or incriminating cut-and-paste activities where we were reluctant to use real students.

Collaborative work

ArtsSmart provides activities for individual and collaborative work as well as opportunities for reflection. The inclusion of collaborative work makes *ArtsSmart* a more useful transition experience for new university students, who can use this as an opportunity to further develop a sense of community with fellow students. This is facilitated by *ArtsSmart*'s online Chat, forums and online Help discussion board. Large subject groups can be divided into tutorial groups for online discussion of the opinion polls or for other specific tasks.

Additional collaborative and comparative writing tasks will be added to the suite of activities. So far we have developed one group activity in the Academic Honesty module entitled the Chain Debate. There are also plans to include email games based on Thiagi's templates (Thiagi, n.d.).

iii. Fidelity to quality learning through the evaluation process

The development of this rich e-learning environment demonstrates fidelity to quality learning. Extensive evaluation has enabled refinement and improvements to the tutorial and this is further evidence of fidelity to achieving high standards and quality learning. Most of the evaluation has centred upon the Academic Honesty module since it has been most widely implemented to date. The evaluation design included provision for:

- Peer review by experts.
- Small focus group of 12 commencing students held towards the end of the development phase.
- 2 trial deliveries to large subject groups during Semester 1 followed by a lengthy questionnaire.
- Survey question at the end of semester.
- Interviews with academic staff.

Each part of the evaluation cycle has been marked by constructive feedback that we were often able to act upon immediately.

Peer review

When the module was in the late stages of development, the product was thoroughly tested by expert reviewers including 2 librarians, an academic and the manager of the plagiarism detection software project at this University. The reviewers commented favourably on the tutorial and their feedback was acted upon.

Small pilot group

A small pilot of the Academic Honesty module was conducted in a computer lab with twelve students in the presence of the content developer and one of the multimedia programmers who both observed the group and interacted freely with them. The students also completed a questionnaire. As a formative evaluation, this was of great value. Many students reported a high level of anxiety about plagiarism, fearing that they would inadvertently plagiarise and fail their assessments. In an attempt to reduce this anxiety, the tone of the module was considerably softened and the sections related to citation were expanded and clarified. As our intent is to offer additional doors to the “repressive, impenetrable, and intimidating” academic environment as Dawson describes the world of academic discourse (2004), we added more demonstrations and opportunities for practice. However it was heartening to note that the students found no difficulty with the navigation and there was a generally positive response to the learning activities.

Large-scale trials

Two larger scale deliveries were conducted during Semester One. About 275 students completed the tutorial in these trials and 189 students completed the evaluation questionnaire.

Case 1 — First year History students

In this class, the tutorial was introduced by the lecturer in a face-to-face lecture setting, and students were then required to complete it in their own time, either at home or in a computer lab on campus. This coincided with the time when the students were given their first essay topics and completion of the module was required as a hurdle requirement.

Case 2 — Second/third year Criminology students

In the second trial, students were introduced to the tutorial in a computer lab during class time and the session was coordinated by a content developer. These students were also introduced to the Copyright module. Verbal feedback from many students indicated that they wished that the Academic Honesty module had been available when they were in first year. The content of the Copyright module was undoubtedly new to almost all of the students.

The questionnaire

The evaluation questionnaire administered to both groups was comprised of thirty Likert scale questions for quantitative analysis. The evaluation questions we aimed to answer were:

- i. Are the *learning objectives* of the courseware clear to the student?
- ii. Is the *content* appropriate?
- iii. How and in what ways is the courseware *engaging* to students?
- iv. How *usable* is the courseware?

- v. Has *learning* occurred as a result of the courseware?
- vi. Is students' *workload* in the courseware appropriate?
- vii. Does the courseware encourage students to *reflect* on their learning?
- viii. How does the courseware affect teacher-learner *relationships*?
- ix. Does the online experience enhance student-to-student and/or student-to-lecturer *communications*?
- x. Was the help and *technical support* adequate?

These sections were accompanied by opportunities to elaborate with free text comments. This qualitative data is particularly useful for planning future enhancements to the tutorial.

There were comments from 4 students that were brutally frank such as: "This was a hurdle requirement, other wise I would have just read the course guide." These 4 students were clearly bored and resentful that they had to complete the tutorial. Others were more pragmatic "the results/answers were a very effective way at enabling me to understand where and how i went wrong in my own answers (sic)" However, in general the responses were positive and some were positively fulsome "The exercises are fantastic~~~ I am after more exercises~~~"

Some of the more revealing quantitative findings are represented in the following tables. The students clearly felt that the content was of a high quality and pitched at an appropriate level for them. They also found that the learning aims of the module were very clear. When asked if the learning aims could have been made clearer, one student responded "only with a sledgehammer"!

Table 1: Student feedback

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The learning aims of <i>ArtsSmart</i> were clear to me				
70	102	12	2	4
The content of <i>ArtsSmart</i> was of high quality				
33	137	18		
The content of <i>ArtsSmart</i> was pitched at an appropriate level for me				
42	126	19	2	

In the area of interest and student engagement (Table 2) the results were firmly positive although many more students responding in the neutral category. Many students commented that the topic of plagiarism was simply not an interesting topic for them. For example, one student remarked: "I thought it is engaging as it CAN be – the topic of academic honesty and plagiarism is simply not the most interesting topic. :)" Another wrote: "To be honest it probably couldn't be, simply because the subject matter isn't all that fascinating!"

When students were asked to comment upon the aspects they found engaging and how the tutorial might be made more engaging, 25 out of the 40 qualitative responses were favourable and suggested no improvements. One student commented, 'I thought most of the aspects were very engaging as it was not what I expected plagiarism to be.' Seven students commented that the exercises were particularly engaging. One student requested more exercises: "The exercises are fantastic~~~ I am after more exercises~~~" and only one found the questions too straightforward. Another commented: "I found it difficult to spot the little things though, I found them challenging."

Table 2: Student feedback

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I became actively involved in my learning				
12	91	64	16	5
I thought <i>ArtsSmart</i> was interesting				
8	77	63	34	7
The questions I was asked were academically challenging				
5	75	61	39	9

We were concerned about the workload involved in this hurdle requirement but found that 125 agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The workload involved in using is just right”. Sixty responded with neutral or disagree. The great majority took between 30 minutes and 60 minutes to complete the Academic Honesty module so the tutorial is not too onerous in terms of time. Only one student took 90 minutes.

As far as navigation was concerned, the majority reported no difficulties. However, many requested a ‘Next’ button at the end of each page. The navigation in *ArtsSmart* is menu-driven and it would be very difficult to incorporate ‘Next’ buttons because the order of the pages and activities is dynamic, depending upon the lecturer’s selections. This is one student response that we are not able to implement but it seemed to stem from navigational habit rather than a navigational problem.

Another constructive suggestion was to incorporate a way of acknowledging that the student had completed the required tasks. Many students clearly felt insecure about whether they had finished the tutorial — a reasonable concern since it was a hurdle requirement. As a result of these evaluations we are including a progress metre so that students can have an indication of their progress through the tutorial.

Students took the feedback opportunity to suggest ways in which the learning could have been improved. The comments about the question “Could the use of text, images and other media be improved, and if so, how?” were interesting and demonstrate quite clearly the diverse learning styles that we are dealing with. 13 of the 50 responses made favourable comments about the use of various media including such comments as: “No I liked the media, it helped to see things differently” A further 4 students requested more use of media as they found that it enhanced their learning. For example the following comments were made:

“Perhaps a bit longer videos as its a bit easier on your mind to watch video than just read”

“Perhaps more videos as these were interactive and hearing a student actually voice issues surrounding plagiarism brings home the reality of the problem to the student”

“more real life examples. the one about the famous singers was good, but there could have been links to the actual audio clips or something”(sic)

However, there were 2 students who took a quite opposing view:

“The videos and the flash movies add nothing. They simply ensure that the exercise takes longer to complete. However, they do provide some (unnecessary reinforcement). Flash movies are generally annoying though.”

“More text less cartoons. If students arent mature enough to read a few pages of script for an assignment they shouldnt be studying at Melbourne.”(sic)

Students were asked to comment on the use of text as well as images and media. Only 2 comments referred to the tutorial as having a lot of text to read. This is a surprisingly small number since there was naturally a lot of reading involved.

Academic response and student reflection

Student and staff responses were again followed up at the end of semester after students completed their essays. The two academics who trialled the project were favourably impressed. One indicated that there had been no instances of plagiarism in her first year course, post *ArtsSmart*. The senior Tutor in the subject noted that there may have been some cases of ‘over-citing’ rather than too little citation”! They received very few negative comments from the students during the trial period except for a few students with technical problems that were easily dealt with by technical staff.

This lecturer added a question to her end-of semester quality of teaching survey -“Did you find the plagiarism module useful”, thus inviting student reflection after they completed the semester’s work. 62 of the 132 responses to this question found that it was useful. One student commented: “yes I found it VERY useful- it greatly improved my essay. I cannot emphasise enough how useful it was”. Another 19 responses were more ambivalent, but they found that it was, at least, useful to some extent. These positive responses account for 62% of the students.

Of those who responded negatively the most common additional comment was encapsulated by one student’s view “Basically told me everything I knew already”. Another commented that it “was very comprehensive, but most of the info was nothing new.” Some of the more ambivalent responses were about it being ‘boring’. This is sure to be an issue for a product dealing with plagiarism. The students do receive a lot of information about plagiarism so there is sure to be overlap with their existing knowledge. This is likely to reduce the challenge and interest for many students.

This creates a dilemma for the creator. In a product of this nature, there is an imperative to cover the topic comprehensively and in some detail because it is difficult to make any assumptions about the knowledge that students possess. Where some students found it boring and obvious, many others found it was ‘helpful and good to help me with the transition from school to uni’. Another commented that it “gave me a clear idea of what is expected of me and what to avoid” In a subject of this nature where there are clear penalties for breach, the decision was made in favour of a comprehensive treatment. When the product is fully implemented some academics may choose to offer pre- testing so that students are not forced to undergo redundant training. However this approach would also mean that the group communication and socialisation aspects would not be addressed.

These student responses may raise the question about whether a tutorial of this nature should be compulsory for all students. The advantage of a compulsory hurdle requirement is that the academic staff can be confident that all students have been given an opportunity to effectively learn about plagiarism. Since 60% of the students on later reflection judged it to be useful, it still seems to be of value as a group requirement. There is also a continuing challenge to find new ways of making the courseware more engaging and effective.

In general the evaluation design has enabled significant improvements to be made to the modules. There has been a good balance of quantitative and qualitative data and the sequencing of the evaluation tools has meant that we have had a broad view of student responses to the Academic Honesty module. Parts of this evaluation process will continue to be replicated for the other modules.

iv. Maintaining the momentum (sustainability)

The key to the sustainability of *ArtsSmart* is the development of CAMS — the Content and Authoring Management System. CAMS supports the authoring of web pages and sites via a web browser interface, and allows both static and dynamic web pages to be organized into hierarchies and shared with other subjects. Hence, generic materials can be re-used between modules and shared with other multimedia projects and this is a very effective form of sustainable development. CAMS also facilitates the use and re-use of learning objects such as demonstrations of database searches. There is always room for improvement in any educational tool and CAMS facilitates the improvement of *ArtsSmart*.

There are the various aspects of the Content Authoring and Management System: The CAMS File Manager facilitates the importing of static content such as web pages, style-sheets, and media files into a subject. Once material is imported, the File Manager allows the developer to create new directories, edit web pages using a web-based WYSIWYG web-authoring tool, and to delete files and folders. A search facility is available for indexed subjects.

Content, including static web pages and quizzes, can be organized into navigational structures, called “sites”, similar to the way one would organize files into folders. In fact, within a site will be a set of folders (and subfolders) with pages in them. These pages can be static content (eg HTML) or dynamic (eg quizzes, document sharing, bulletin board) content. A subject may have more than one “site” within which content has been organized. Every “site” can be given a different look-and-feel by using Themes. Themes consist of graphical elements, HTML elements and Cascading Style Sheets that can all be customised to suit the needs of a particular academic and student group.

When content has been organized into a “site”, students who access that site will see a dynamically generated navigation menu on the left-hand-side of the web browser window. The graphics, fonts and colours used in the navigation menu can be customised by a content developer (the academic or information division specialist). Using this, a student will know which page in the structure they are on and they will be able to easily navigate to another page.

This is particularly useful for the across faculty implementation of *ArtsSmart*. Content created in one subject can be shared with others, yet still ‘branded’ for each distinctive subject. Content within CAMS can be made accessible to other subjects and a subject’s “site” can incorporate content borrowed from other subjects within the system. This encourages content re-use across subjects.

Those interested in obtaining more information about CAMS, can explore the Courseware Development Services website (Wesley et al., 2004).

Plans for the future

Throughout the *ArtsSmart* tutorial, technology has been used to teach transferable skills and to impart knowledge that will greatly assist all students in their transition to University level research. However through the inventiveness of CAMS, these generic programs can still be integrated into the curriculum. In addressing the themes of academic honesty and information literacy, *ArtsSmart* represents an attempt to fulfil an obligation to our students to assist them to develop sound scholarly practices.

Additional deliveries are planned for Semester 2, 2005 and beyond. The Academic Honesty module will be included as a hurdle requirement in an online international Universitas 21 subject to be delivered in August 2005. Full implementation of *ArtsSmart* throughout the faculty offers opportunities for invigorating teaching and learning with multimedia that complements the face-to-face teaching of a campus-based university. Other faculties have expressed interest in taking up the challenge of providing timely and tailored support for students using this program. We hope that by adding to the armoury of tools of teachers and learners about academic honesty and information literacy we will also open doors for active engagement in the discourse of their chosen subjects.

References

- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 187–203.
- Biggs, J. B. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bruce, C. (2002). *Information literacy as a catalyst for educational change: A background paper*. [White paper for UNESCO]
- Dawson, J. (2004). *A perspective on plagiarism*. Paper presented at HERDSA 2004.
- Ellis, J., & Salisbury, F. (2004). Information literacy milestones: Building on the prior knowledge of first year students. *Australian Library Journal*, 53(4), 383–397.
- Harris, R. (2001). *The plagiarism handbook: Strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*. Los Angeles: Pycszak Publishing.
- Hirst, D., Brooks, C., & Riddle, M. (2004). Courseware design and development program: Providing professional development and project experience. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer, & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ascilite conference* (pp. 387–394). Perth, 5–8 December. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/hirst.html>
- James, R., & Baldwin, G. (1997). *Tutoring and demonstrating: A guide for the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
- James, R., McInnis, C., & Devlin, M. (2002). *Assessing learning in Australian universities*. Melbourne: CSHE, University of Melbourne.
- Mulcahy, S., & Goodacre, C. (2004). Opening pandora's box of academic integrity: Using plagiarism detection software. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer, & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ascilite conference* (pp. 688–696). Perth, 5–8 December. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/mulcahy.html>
- Salisbury, F., & Ellis, J. (2003). Online and face-to-face: Evaluating methods for teaching information literacy skills to undergraduate arts students. *Library Review*, 52(5), 209–217.
- Stoney, S., & McMahon, M. (2004). Bulletproof assessment, war stories, and tactics: Avoiding cybercheating. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer, & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ascilite conference* (pp. 881–886). Perth, 5–8 December. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/stoney.html>
- Thiagi. (n.d.). *Email games*. Retrieved June 7, 2005 from <http://www.thiagi.com/email-depolarizer.html>
- Wesley, N., Vasjuta, D., Yau, G., & Robertson, D. (2004). *NEO*. Retrieved from <http://cw.meu.unimelb.edu.au/>
- Williams, J. (2002). *The plagiarism problem: Are students entirely to blame?* Paper presented at the 2002 ascilite conference.

Acknowledgments

Dr Steven Welch, Department of History, Faculty of Arts as Project Leader

Courseware Development team:

Gordon Yau, Neroli Wesley, David Vasjuta, (Programming and software development)

Josella Rye (Graphic design)

Russell Evans, Ian Shiel, Gillian McTigue (Video production)

Lee McRae (Photography)

We would like to thank the staff and students in History 131-145 USA Today: Society, Culture, and Identity; with special thanks to Dr Katherine Ellinghaus and Ms Prue Flowers.

We would like to thank the staff and student in 191-004 Introduction to Research Methods; with special thanks to Dr Julie Evans.

Thanks also to the students of the academic centre at St Mary's and Newman colleges.

Dr Anthony McCosker, Language and Learning Skills Unit commented helpfully on the draft.

Ms Mary Coghlan, Ms Anna Shadbolt and Ms Sabina Robertson all participated in the expert review of the module.

Author contact details

Claire Brooks

Information and Education Services, The University of Melbourne

c.brooks@unimelb.edu.au

Jenny Ellis

Information Management

The University of Melbourne

jje@unimelb.edu.au

Copyright © 2005 Claire Brooks and Jenny Ellis

The author(s) assign to ascilite and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive licence to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The author(s) also grant a non-exclusive licence to ascilite to publish this document on the ascilite web site (including any mirror or archival sites that may be developed) and in printed form within the ascilite 2005 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the author(s).