

Bronx Community College
The City University of New York
Committee on Instruction and Professional Development
Faculty and Staff Lounge, Basement, B001, Language Hall

AGENDA

February 5th, 2019

- I. Call to order (2 minutes) ✓
- II. Approval of the Minutes (5 minutes) ✓
- III. Update on BCC policy on academic integrity changes (Rebeca Araya) ✓
- IV. Update on 2018 Pilot Student Survey Results (Chris Efthimiou) ✓
- V. Update on Presidential Grant Rubric for 2019-2020 (Rebeca Araya) ✓ *table. consent*
- VI. Faculty Day Spring 2019 Updates (Mara Lazda) ✓
- VII. Department Announcements (5 minutes)
- VIII. New Business

Next meeting on Tuesday, March 5th, 2019

NAME	DEPT.	EMAIL	SIGNATURE
Rebeca Araya	Biology	rebeca.araya@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Rebeca Araya</i>
Frank Blanchard	Art/Music	frank.blanchard@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>F.D. Blanchard</i>
Kelvin Cooper	HPER	kelvin.cooper@bcc.cuny.edu	
Angel Falcón	Library	angel.falcon@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Angel Falcón</i>
Zaida Godoy-Navarro	Modern Languages	zaida.godoy-navarro@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Zaida Godoy-Navarro</i>
Yunchun Hu	Mathematics	yunchun.hu@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Yunchun Hu</i>
Howard Irby, Jr.	Business	howard.irby-jr@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Howard Irby, Jr.</i>
Hamad Khan	Engineering, Physics & Tech.	hamad.khan@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Hamad Khan</i>
Elise Langan	Reading and Education	elise.langan@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Elise Langan</i>
Mara Lazda	History	mara.lazda@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Mara Lazda</i>
<i>Julio Guest</i> Sunej Hans	Chemistry	Sunej.hans@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Sunej Hans</i>
Joël Magloire	Comm., Arts & Sciences	joel.magloire@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Joël Magloire</i>
Katherine Acevedo-Coppa	OAA	Katherine.acevedo-coppa@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Katherine Acevedo-Coppa</i>
Jawied Nawabi	Social Sciences	jawied.nawabi@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>Jawied Nawabi</i>
John Ziegler	English	john.ziegler@bcc.cuny.edu	<i>John Ziegler</i>
Lisa Ighomuaye	SGA	Lisa.ighomuaye@stu.bcc.cuny.edu	
Clarence Hodge	Nursing	Clarence.hodge@bcc.cuny.edu	
<i>Guest</i> MARK LENNERTON	CTLT	MARK.LENNERTON@BCC.CUNY.EDU	<i>Mark Lennerton</i>
VIVIAN RODRIGUEZ	Nursing/Radiology	VIVIAN.RODRIGUEZ@BCC.CUNY.EDU	<i>Vivian Rodriguez</i>

4/16/19

4-6 pm

Fac Staff lounge

BOO1

LH

Corrected.

Bronx Community College
The City University of New York
Committee on Instruction and Professional Development
Meeting Minutes
December 4th, 2018
North Law 314—Law Library

Present: Rebeca Araya; Kelvin Cooper; Angel Falcon; Zaida Godoy-Navarro; Yunchun Hu; Elise Langan; Mara Lazda; Joël Magloire; John Ziegler; Katherine Acevedo-Coppa; Sunej Hans; Vivian Rodriguez; Jawied Nawabi; Crystal Rodriguez; Lisa Ighomuaye; Clarence Hodge

- I. Call to Order—R. Araya—4:12pm
- II. Approval of the Minutes—R. Araya
 - a. The minutes for the October 3rd, November 6th, and November 27th meetings were approved with appropriate edits.
- III. Update on the BCC policy on Academic Integrity changes to the Catalog—A. Ott
 - a. A. Ott provided the BMCC Policy on Plagiarism as an example of a policy the Body can consider in supplementing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity.
 - b. A. Ott suggested that the Body create a subcommittee to draft a three paragraph statement on plagiarism noting that it would be best to ensure that any statement drafted by the subcommittee refer directly to the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity to avoid confusion and not allow for loopholes. The general procedure for the subcommittee is to draft the policy statement, bring the statement to the Body for recommendations, the representatives bring the statement to their respective departments, return to the Body with faculty feedback for integration, and then send to the Senate for consideration. The standing question is whether this statement would be an informational item or an actionable voting item in the Senate. The answer to this question would have an effect on the timeline. R. Araya will follow up with F. Moore in the Senate for clarification.
 - c. A subcommittee was created with A. Falcon, J. Ziegler, V. Rodriguez., and R. Araya to draft the plagiarism statement.
- IV. Update on Pilot Student Survey—R. Araya
 - a. Chris Efthimiou sent an email to R. Araya that informed the Body that the pilot was underway.
 - b. L. Ighomuaye noted that evaluations during midterms may provide a fuller picture to the faculty member for feedback.
- V. Update on the Faculty (COACHE) Survey—K. Acevedo-Coppa
 - a. The survey will open on February 4th and close on April 7th to full time faculty.
 - b. The Body deliberated and concluded that it **STRONGLY RECOMMENDS** that the COACHE Survey include part-time (Adjunct) faculty. Part-time (Adjunct) faculty provide a vital service to the BCC community. They do the majority of teaching on campus and deserve a voice in making their college a better place to work. The Body believes their voices **MUST** be heard for any faculty survey to present a full picture of the current environment at BCC for faculty.
- VI. Update on the Presidential Grant Rubric for 2019-2020—R. Araya

- a. The draft version of the Rubric was circulated and discussed. Edits will be made. The edited version will be shared with CIPD via email to be voted upon at the next meeting of the Body.
- VII. Faculty Day Spring 2019 Updates—M. Lazda
 - a. The Call for Proposals on the theme of Social Justice and the Community College will circulate soon. Deadline for submissions is March 1st, 2019.
 - b. The subcommittee has not yet heard from Ritchie Torres so is reaching out to Liza Jessie Peterson. A. Falcon suggested a new potential candidate for keynote speaker, Daisy Coco de Filippis, Ph.D. She is a CUNY graduate and president of Naugatuck Valley Community College in Connecticut.
- VIII. Dates for Next Meetings
 - a. The Body voted unanimously to have meetings on January 29th, February 5th, and March 5th of 2019.
- IX. New Business
 - a. The English Department is having its final Poetry Reading at the NL-251 Law Library on Thursday, December 6th.
 - b. M. Lazda announced that Assessment Day will be on Friday December 7th, 2018.
 - c. R. Araya reported from the CUNY Faculty Affairs Advisory Board meeting of November 12th.
 - i. There was a discussion of the draft CUNY-wide COACHE custom questions and whether they were wholesale applicable to full time and part time faculty. A question arose as to whether or not there was a “Not Applicable” answer available to the respondent.
 - ii. There is a new CUNY Faculty Cloud Policy Advisory Group being formed. Any faculty member interested should consult their CIPD representative for information. Information on where to sign up was mentioned on the handout given at the meeting.
 - iii. Diversifying CUNY’s Leadership: A CUNY-Harvard Consortium is still taking applications by professorial-line faculty members with some administrative experience and will close December 21st, 2018.
 - iv. The CUNY Faculty Diversity and Inclusion Conference is soliciting proposals due January 7th, 2019.
- X. Meeting adjourned at 5:35pm
- XI. Next Meeting—January 29th. Location TBA.

Submitted,

Angel Falcon

LGCC

Academic Dishonesty is prohibited in the City University of New York and is punishable by penalties ranging from a grade of "F" on a given test, research paper or assignment, to an "F" in the course, or suspension or expulsion from the College. The following is adapted from The CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity.

Academic Dishonesty includes: CHEATING — the unauthorized use or attempted use of material, information, notes, study aids, devices or communication during an academic exercise. Examples: Copying from a student during an examination, unauthorized collaboration on take home assignments, submitting someone else's work as your own, allowing another student to take an examination for you, or unauthorized use of notes, electronic devices or other materials during an examination.

PLAGIARISM — the act of presenting another person's ideas, research or writings as your own. Examples: Copying another person's actual words without the use of quotation marks and/or footnotes, failure to acknowledge a source when using information that is not common knowledge or failure to acknowledge collaborators on homework or laboratory assignments.

INTERNET PLAGIARISM — plagiarism that includes the submitting of downloaded term papers or parts of term papers as a student's own work, paraphrasing or copying information from the internet without citing the source, as well as other forms of "cutting and pasting."

OBTAINING UNFAIR ADVANTAGE — any activity that intentionally or unintentionally gives a student an unfair academic advantage over other students. Examples: Stealing, circulating or otherwise gaining access to unauthorized examination materials, intentionally obstructing or interfering with another student's work, depriving other students of access to needed class or library materials by stealing, destroying or defacing them, retaining or circulating examination materials that clearly should have been returned at the end of the exam.

FALSIFICATION OF RECORDS AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS — Examples: Forging signatures or authorization, falsifying information on academic records, falsifying official documents such as grade reports, drop/add forms, ID cards or other college documents.

MISCONDUCT ON INTERNSHIPS — behavior inappropriate to a professional setting or in violation of the rules established by either the College or the internship site. Noncompliance with local, state and federal laws while on internship is also included.

talk to judicial

→ PASSES

UNanimous

Student Evaluation of Faculty Pilot Survey, Fall 2018

BCC is planning to update the Student Evaluation of Faculty Survey and appreciate your time and input on the draft survey form. Please rate your course and instructor on the scales provided. We also ask that you provide any written comments on the course.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/Not applicable
Q1	Course assignments and requirements were clear in the course syllabus.	165 (83.3%)	29 (14.6%)	4 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q2	The instructor followed the course syllabus.	166 (84.3%)	28 (14.2%)	3 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q3	The instructor encouraged students to ask questions.	150 (76.1%)	37 (18.8%)	8 (4.1%)	2 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q4	The instructor clearly answered questions raised by students.	148 (80.0%)	32 (17.3%)	3 (1.6%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q5	The instructor used examples to explain lessons.	169 (79.7%)	36 (17.0%)	7 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q6	The instructor encouraged class participation.	165 (78.2%)	34 (16.1%)	8 (3.8%)	4 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q7	The instructor treated students fairly.	167 (80.7%)	30 (14.5%)	7 (3.4%)	3 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q8	The instructor evaluated/graded the material assigned/presented to students in the course.	153 (84.5%)	23 (12.7%)	3 (1.7%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Q9	The instructor explained methods of evaluating student work clearly.	128 (77.1%)	30 (18.1%)	5 (3.0%)	2 (1.2%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Q10	The instructor reviewed exams and/or assignments with comments.	172 (79.6%)	32 (14.8%)	8 (3.7%)	3 (1.4%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Q11	The instructor clearly explained how to succeed in the class ^{course} .	172 (79.3%)	37 (17.1%)	7 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)
Q12	The instructor is knowledgeable in the subject of the course.	183 (85.1%)	27 (12.6%)	3 (1.4%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)
Q13	The instructor was inclusive towards students with respect to race, religion, gender and gender expression, disability, and sexual orientation.	175 (81.8%)	31 (14.5%)	4 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.4%)
Q14	The instructor was available via office hours, email, and/or online presence.	176 (83.0%)	31 (14.6%)	4 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Q15	Instructor clearly presented ^{the} course material in class and/or online.	177 (86.8%)	20 (9.8%)	5 (2.5%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)

Q16 My overall grade in the course up to now is...

76 (40.0%) A	6 (3.2%) D
67 (35.3%) B	1 (0.5%) F
15 (7.9%) C	25 (13.2%) Don't Know

Q17 This course is...

14 (7.0%) Very Difficult	85 (42.5%) Not too Difficult
97 (48.5%) Somewhat Difficult	4 (2.0%) Don't Know

Q18 Reasons for taking this course

140 (78.2%) Curriculum Requirement	6 (3.4%) Personal Interest
30 (16.8%) Graduation Requirement	3 (1.7%) Other

Q19 Please provide any written comments on the course.

100 (100.0%)

2019 BCC Presidential Grant Program Scoring Rubric

In evaluating the grant proposal, pick an integer from 0 to 5 that best fits.

Category	Excellent (5-4 pts)	Good (3-2 pts)	Insufficient (1-0 pt)
Project Design Description of what is being proposed, who will participate and when activities will occur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are very clearly articulated and realistic. Participants are clearly identified and/or assured to participate. Timeframe and accountabilities are clear and realistic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are somewhat articulated and may be realistic. Participants are somewhat identified/may participate. Timeframe and accountabilities are provided and possibly can be accomplished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are not clearly identified and/or not realistic. Participants are not clearly identified and unlikely to engage. Timeframe and accountabilities are not clear or realistic.
Project Relevance/ Student Need How project relates to themes such as addressing student need, improving student success, academic progress, and completion rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All project goals directly address student need, support improved student success, academic progress, and completion rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some project goals address student need, support student success, academic progress, and completion rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project goals have no substantial relationship to student need, student success, academic progress, and completion rates
Project Rationale Why project design is expected to yield anticipated results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project rationale is based on solid theory and/or credible evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project rationale is based on some theory and/or some evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no theoretical or empirical basis for project rationale
Impact/Scope What are the expected measurable outcomes; who and how many people will be impacted? Over what timeframe?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated outcomes are clearly identified; realistic; and significant (either in numbers impacted or in the quality of impact). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes are identified and reasonable; Anticipated impact is considerable (in numbers or in quality of impact). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes are not specific; are not reasonable to expect; or are not significant (either in numbers or quality of impact).
Budget Specific projected itemized costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear articulation of what budget will support, why it is needed for project and how it realistically supports project activities/outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget presented clearly and should support project activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is not clear/itemized/justified.
Overall Evaluation Overall importance of project and quality of concept, implementation strategy and anticipated results. Quality of Writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall excellent quality of concept, implementation strategy and anticipated results. Excellent quality of writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall good quality of concept, implementation strategy and anticipated results. Good quality of writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall average or fair quality of concept, implementation strategy and anticipated results. Insufficient quality of writing.

Call for Presentations for the Seventh Annual BCC

FACULTY DAY

Sharing Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching
Friday, April 12, 2019

.....

Theme: "Social Justice and the Community College"

Do community colleges have a particular role in advocating for social justice? Community college presidents Cynthia M. Heelan and Gail C. Mellow have suggested that community colleges have had an implicit "social contract with America to prepare citizens and workers for entry into the middle class."

What does social justice look like at BCC? We invite faculty and the BCC community to consider this implicit mission and how it is reflected in scholarship, performance, and teaching. Faculty, staff, and students are welcome to submit proposals.

Deadline for proposals: Monday, February 25, 2019

Use this link to submit: [link will be inserted]

Please consult the evaluation rubric available here:
<http://www.bcc.cuny.edu/Broadcasts/2018/03/RubricFD2017.pdf>

Proposal process:

Research presentations and posters, creative works (e.g., art, poetry, dance, scientific), and workshop proposals are all welcome.

General format and time guidelines:

Individual presentations: 20-25 minutes

Posters: May be digital or physical. Authors will have opportunity to answer questions.

Panels and roundtables (3-4 presenters): 75 minutes

Workshops (includes hands-on interactive component): 60 minutes

Please note that proposals that speak to an interdisciplinary audience are preferred.
Please indicate how your work contributes to the theme of this year's Faculty Day.

Your proposal must include:

Name, department, and position

Title of presentation

Type of presentation (individual, workshop, panel, poster)

Abstract of 250 words or less.

Names of collaborators/co-presenters if applicable

Faculty Day is organized by the Committee on Instruction and Professional Development (CIPD) with the support of the Division of Academic and Student Success and the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology.

Contact CIPD Chair Rebeca Araya (Biology and Biological Sciences)

rebeca.araya@bcc.cuny.edu or your department's CIPD representative with any questions.

<p>Criterion</p>	<p>Excellent 15</p>	<p>Good 14</p>	<p>Satisfactory 13</p>	<p>Fair (2 0s)</p>	<p>Poor 1</p>
<p>1. Currency, Importance and Appropriateness to the Field and Audience</p>	<p>The topic is cutting-edge, immediately relevant, or highly significant to the theme. It is definitely a session worth attending.</p>	<p>The topic is current, important and appropriate to the theme and audience. It is probably a session worth attending.</p>	<p>The topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the theme and audience. It may be a session worth attending.</p>	<p>The topic is tangentially related to the theme, or not current or important to the audience. It is probably not a session worth attending.</p>	<p>The topic is not current, lacks importance or is not appropriate to the theme and/or audience. It is not a session worth attending.</p>
<p>2. Purpose & Participant Outcomes</p>	<p>The session objective and participant outcomes are clear in the session title and/or description. Readers can envision what will be learned and it contains specifics that make the reader want to learn more.</p>	<p>The session objective and participant outcomes are clear in the session title and/or description, and it is clear how they will guide the audience's session selection.</p>	<p>The session objective and participant outcomes are stated or implied, but may not be focused enough to aid in audience's session selection.</p>	<p>The session objective and participant outcomes are too general or broad to be achievable, or too narrow to be useful.</p>	<p>The session objective or participant outcomes are not stated or implied, or are not clear.</p>
<p>3. Motivated by Theory, Practice and/or Research</p>	<p>The abstract refers specifically to the appropriate theory, practice or research on which the presentation is based, in a thorough and comprehensible way that relates directly to presentation content.</p>	<p>The abstract refers clearly to theory, practice and/or research on which the presentation is based, in a way that is clear and related directly to presentation content.</p>	<p>The abstract refers to some extent to theory, practice and/or research on which the presentation is based.</p>	<p>The abstract refers to theory, practice or research, but it is not specific or doesn't relate to the content of the presentation.</p>	<p>It is unclear from the abstract how this session is connected to theory, practice or research.</p>
<p>4. Clarity of Proposal as Indicator of Presentation Quality</p>	<p>The proposal abstract is well written and indicates that the presentation will be of professional quality.</p>	<p>The proposal abstract is clearly written and suggests that the quality of the presentation will be good.</p>	<p>The abstract is adequately written but indicates that the presenter may not have a good sense of the conference audience, or the quality may be uneven.</p>	<p>The way in which the abstract is written suggests that the delivery of the presentation may be weak.</p>	<p>The way in which the abstract is written indicates that the delivery of the presentation may be poor.</p>

CIPD Chair's Report for February 5th, 2019

CUNY Faculty Affairs Advisory Board Meeting, February 4, 2019

1) Announcements

- a. COACHE is starting the CUNY Faculty Survey this week. Please contact Dr. Annemarie Nicols- Grinenko and/or BCC Liaison (Chris Efthimiou or Katherine Acevedo-Coppa) for questions about the survey.
<http://www2.cuny.edu/academics/faculty-affairs/the-collaborative-on-academic-careers-in-higher-education-coache/>
- b. Check for upcoming grant deadlines on CUNY FAAB website under the faculty resources page.
<http://www2.cuny.edu/academics/faculty-affairs/funding-opportunities/>
- c. Dr. Annemarie Grinenko always wants submissions of faculty accomplishments.
Please email: Annmarie.nicols-grinenko@cuny.edu

2) Faculty Development at CUNY

- a. Baruch College (*Patricia Price, Associate Provost for Academic Administration, Faculty Development & Research*)

Baruch focuses on 3 target groups: New Faculty, New Department Chairs and Mid-Career Faculty who feel stuck in their positions. Baruch provides seminars, training workshops and peer mentoring to all 3 groups in order to ease transitions and encourage promotion.
- b. New York City College of Technology (*Julia Jordan, Director of Faculty Commons and Professor in Hospitality Management*)

NYCCT focuses heavily on part-time teaching staff training and mentoring by providing workshops to learn about college resources and best practices in pedagogy. The NYCCT faculty commons sends out weekly questions to faculty to inform them about different topics such as how students can manage test anxiety and how to avoid plagiarism.
- c. John Jay College of Criminal Justice (*Allison Pease, Associate to the Provost for Faculty and Professor of English*)

JJCCJ offers grant writing seminars for such topics as practical teaching, problem-based learning, OER and library research services. All junior faculty are paired with a senior mentor and together they create an individual development plan. Mentor and mentee must meet 2 hours each month.

3) Group Discussion: Assessing faculty development efforts

The faculty present discussed ways that faculty development may be assessed particularly in light of success in promotion and beneficial student outcomes. One suggestion was tracking the number of papers that promoted faculty produce. Can we link student outcomes directly to any faculty development efforts? Some faculty mentioned that they give pre and post surveys in classrooms and in on-line courses to attempt to measure student satisfaction with faculty efforts.

1114

For CIPD Feb 5, 2019 agenda: Item IV. 2018 Pilot Student Survey:

506
NOTES

According to Chris Efthimiou of Director of Institutional Research and Testing at BCC, "We have licensing information on two different electronic student evaluation platforms: Blue by Explorance and Class Climate by Scantron. Blue by Explorance is currently used by Guttman Community College and Class Climate by Scantron, Lehman College. Licensing costs (calculated based on enrollment) are much higher for Blue than for Class Climate. Both solutions integrate with Blackboard so surveys can be accessed through the portal. Also, we currently have a license for an online survey software platform called Snap that can e-mail surveys like the other platforms but the system does not have as robust a reporting system and there is no system integration functionality with Learning Management systems like Blackboard as do the two student evaluation platforms. This Snap option is the least expensive from a licensing perspective but would require more home-grown development/programming work. Representatives from all three companies (Explorance, Snap and Scantron) are willing to demonstrate the survey platform to the committee or sub-committee if requested. [Chris] suggests that we schedule some demonstrations in the spring semester."

Respectfully submitted,

Rebeca Araya
Biology Lecturer and CIPD Chair

[\(https://www.baruch.cuny.edu/\)](https://www.baruch.cuny.edu/)

Search 

MENU

[ABOUT BARUCH \(/ABOUT/\)](#) [ADMISSIONS \(/ADMISSIONS/\)](#) [ACADEMICS \(/ACADEMIC/\)](#) [ARTS \(/ARTS/\)](#)

[Faculty Handbook \(index.htm\)](#)

[Faculty Handbook Index of Topics \(http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/topics.htm\)](http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/topics.htm)

[Adjunct Faculty Handbook Home \(adjunct-handbook-retired.htm\)](#)

The Baruch College Faculty Handbook

Plagiarism

Definitions, Tutorial for Students, Procedures, Hints for Discouraging

Last updated on 1/13/15

Definitions

Brief definitions of plagiarism are available within the [A Faculty Guide to Student Academic Integrity](#).

([./academic/academic_integrity.htm](#)). For a direct link to the definitions, go [here](#)

([./academic/academic_integrity.htm#plagiarism_definition](#)). Information on Writing Center webpage, go [here](#)

(<http://writingcenter.baruch.cuny.edu/online-resources/writing-guides/using-sources/>). The sections on plagiarism in the College's writing handbook may be helpful: our freshmen (entering September 2007) should have Fowler and Aaron, *The Little, Brown Handbook* (pp. 629-38); undergraduates who entered as freshmen from September 2002 through September 2006 should have copies of Ann Raimes, *Keys for Writers*, (4th ed., pp. 116-128; 3rd ed., pp. 104-112). Also see the Plagiarism Tutorial (below).

Plagiarism Tutorial for Students

The [plagiarism tutorial \(http://newman.baruch.cuny.edu/help/plagiarism/default.htm\)](http://newman.baruch.cuny.edu/help/plagiarism/default.htm) was prepared by members of the Newman Library staff and revised during AY 2010-11. Easily accessible to all students online, it has an accompanying interactive self-test that is available only via Blackboard. The self-test must be imported into your class Blackboard site. To import the test, contact **Prof. Aisha Peña**: (646) 312-1611 or Aisha.Pena@baruch.cuny.edu (<mailto:Aisha.Pena@baruch.cuny.edu>).

Help in Detecting Plagiarism: Turnitin.com

Faculty members may arrange for their students' work to be submitted to the online commercial service called "Turnitin.com." To learn how to gain access to Baruch College's subscription to this service and for suggestions about how to use it, contact **Prof.**

Policies and Procedures

The College's policies and procedures for dealing with violations of academic integrity, including plagiarism, are delineated in detail within [A Faculty Guide to Student Academic Integrity](#) ([./academic/academic_integrity.htm](#)) and are summarized [here](#) ([documents/Ac_Integr_Summary_Fall_03.htm](#)).

CUNY's Academic Integrity Policy, revised July 2011, is available [here](#) ([documents/CUNYAcademicIntegrityPolicyrev.2011.pdf](#)).

Some hints to help discourage plagiarism (also see the [Faculty Guide](#) ([./academic/academic_integrity.htm](#)))

- * Define plagiarism clearly and clearly convey that you will not tolerate it. (see above for sources for definitions, examples, and explanations), including the [plagiarism tutorial](#) (<http://newman.baruch.cuny.edu/help/plagiarism/default.htm>).
- * Create writing assignments that require students to synthesize materials from different sources (compare/contrast) or to use materials discussed/provided in class.
- * When students have handed in written work such as a substantial paper, ask them to write a summary in class of its main points and how they made them.
- * Ask students to submit copies of their sources along with research papers (photocopies of pages from books, pages from the web etc.) with the relevant material highlighted.

Additional materials that might be relevant are available on Baruch's [academic integrity home page](#) ([AcademicIntegrity.htm](#)).

Also: a website on plagiarism detection may be found at <http://www.plagiarism.org> (<http://www.plagiarism.org>); a site with numerous links to "best practices" developed at various colleges appears at <http://www.collegecrunch.org/steering-clear-of-plagiarism-in-the-college-crunch/> (<http://www.collegecrunch.org/steering-clear-of-plagiarism-in-the-college-crunch/>). Another that brings together a number of useful links is <http://www.marcaria.com/internet-resources-on-citing-the-trademark-of-a-good-writer.asp> (<http://www.marcaria.com/internet-resources-on-citing-the-trademark-of-a-good-writer.asp>).

[Contact Us](#) ([/contact.html](#))

[About Our Site](#)
([/about_site.html](#))

[Privacy](#)
([/web_site_privacy_policy.htm](#))

[Site Map](#) ([/loc.html](#))

[Text Only](#)
(<https://www2.cuny.edu/oc/technology/text-version/>)

One Bernard Baruch Way (55 Lexington Ave. at 24th St)
New York, NY 10010 646-312-1000



