

---

# University of Arizona Program in Research Integrity Education Monthly Newsletter

*A Federally Mandated Compliance Education Program*

---

July 1, 2005

Volume 5, No. 7

---

## *A Message from the Director*

*Thomas P. Davis, Ph.D.*

This month the Program in Research Integrity Education (P.R.I.E.) newsletter highlights research done by Don McCabe, founding President of the *Center for Academic Integrity* (CAI) at the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University. Dr. McCabe's research findings indicate that cheating and plagiarism among students continues to be high, but that honor codes are shown to be effective in reducing academic misconduct. You may visit the Center for Academic Integrity website at the following: [http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai\\_research.asp](http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai_research.asp).

Also included in this issue is the *University of Arizona Code of Academic Integrity*. It is important that students and faculty are familiar with these procedures and codes. You may access the *Student Policies, Procedures and Codes* at the following web address: <http://web.arizona.edu/~dos/uapolicies/cai1.html>.

In other news, the P.R.I.E. welcomes Dr. Tom Lindell as the new Research Integrity Officer (R.I.O.) for the University of Arizona. As Director of P.R.I.E., I will continue to work in concert with Dr. Lindell, as I did with our past R.I.O., Dr. Tom Hixon, to assure that the entire University of Arizona community is in Federal Compliance in the area of Research Integrity Education. We welcome Dr. Tom Lindell!

---

### **About the University of Arizona Program in Research Integrity Education (P.R.I.E.):**

The P.R.I.E. newsletter is the instrument wherein the University of Arizona (UA) is able to meet the terms and Federal mandates for research integrity education (R.I.E.). The UA is required by federal law to provide education in the areas of responsible conduct in research (RCR), information that is critical to all UA

researchers, administration, faculty, staff and students. Each month we at the P.R.I.E. search data bases nationwide and worldwide in order to deliver the most current and accurate information to the UA research community regarding research ethics and integrity. We provide information on educational opportunities available at the UA, and nationwide. We are in constant contact with the Office of Research Integrity, the Public Health Service (PHS) including the National Institutes of Health (NIH), The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP), The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the United States Department of Health and Human Service (HHS), and many others. In this manner we are able to keep the UA research community abreast of updates on research integrity laws and regulations, as well as fulfill the requirements of both state and federal governments for universities to be eligible to receive federal funds. We trust that you will take advantage of the many hours of research done by our office to keep you informed and compliant.

---

### **The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) Research**

---

*In New CAI Research Conducted By Don McCabe (Released In June, 2005) Levels Of Cheating And Plagiarism Remain High. Honor Codes And Modified Codes Are Shown To Be Effective In Reducing Academic Misconduct.*

As part of CAI's Assessment Project, almost 50,000 undergraduates on more than 60 campuses have participated in a nationwide survey of academic integrity since the fall of 2002. The most recent results (released in June of 2005) are disturbing, provocative, and challenging.

- On most campuses, 70% of students admit to some cheating. Close to one-quarter of the participating students admitted to serious test cheating in the past year and half

- admitted to one or more instances of serious cheating on written assignments.
- Academic honor codes effectively reduce cheating. Surveys conducted in 1990, 1995, and 1999, involving over 12,000 students on 48 different campuses, demonstrate the impact of honor codes and student involvement in the control of academic dishonesty. Serious test cheating on campuses with honor codes is typically 1/3 to 1/2 lower than the level on campuses that do not have honor codes. The level of serious cheating on written assignments is 1/4 to 1/3 lower.
  - Internet plagiarism is a growing concern on all campuses as students struggle to understand what constitutes acceptable use of the Internet. In the absence of clear direction from faculty, most students have concluded that 'cut & paste' plagiarism – using a sentence or two (or more) from different sources on the Internet and weaving this information together into a paper without appropriate citation - is not a serious issue. While 10% of students admitted to engaging in such behavior in 1999, almost 40% admit to doing so in the Assessment Project surveys. A majority of students (77%) believe such cheating is not a very serious issue.
  - Faculty are reluctant to take action against suspected cheaters. In Assessment Project surveys involving almost 10,000 faculty in the last three years, 44% of those who were aware of student cheating in their course in the last three years, have never reported a student for cheating to the appropriate campus authority. Students suggest that cheating is higher in courses where it is well known that faculty members are likely to ignore cheating.
  - Longitudinal comparisons show significant increases in serious test / examination cheating and unpermitted student collaboration. For example, the number of students self-reporting instances of unpermitted collaboration at nine medium to large state universities increased from 11% in a 1963 survey to 49% in 1993. This trend seems to be continuing: between 1990 and 1995, instances of unpermitted collaboration at 31 small to medium schools increased from 30% to 38%.
  - Studies of 18,000 students at 61 schools, conducted in the last four years, suggest cheating is also a significant problem in high school – over 70% of respondents at public and parochial schools admitted to one or more instances of serious test cheating and over 60% admitted to some form of plagiarism. Slightly less than half of the respondents from private schools admitted similar behaviors. About half of all students admitted they had engaged in some level of plagiarism using the Internet.

---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**  
**Code of Academic Integrity**

---

**Principle:** Integrity is expected of every student in all academic work. The guiding principle of academic integrity is that a student's submitted work must be the student's own. This principle is furthered by the student Code of Conduct and disciplinary procedures established by ABOR Policies 5-308 - 5-403, all provisions of which apply to all University of Arizona students. This Code of Academic Integrity (hereinafter "the Code") is intended to fulfill the requirement imposed by ABOR Policy 5-403.A.4 and otherwise to supplement the student Code of Conduct as permitted by ABOR Policy 5-308.C.1.

**Prohibited Conduct:** Conduct prohibited by the Code consists of all forms of academic dishonesty, including, but not limited to: cheating, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, and plagiarism as set out and defined in the Code of Conduct, ABOR Policy 5-308-E.10 and F.1; submitting an item of academic work that has previously been submitted without fair citation of the original work or authorization by the faculty member supervising the work; modifying any academic work to obtain additional credit in the same class unless approved in advance by the faculty member; failure to observe rules of academic integrity established by a faculty member for a particular course; and attempting to commit an act prohibited by this Code. Any attempt to commit an act prohibited by these rules shall be subject to sanctions to the same extent as completed acts.

**Student Responsibility:** Students engaging in academic dishonesty diminish their education and bring discredit to the academic community.

Students shall not violate the Code of Academic Integrity and shall avoid situations likely to compromise academic integrity. Students shall observe the generally applicable provisions of this Code whether or not faculty members establish special rules of academic integrity for particular classes. Failure of faculty to prevent cheating does not excuse students from compliance with the Code.

**Faculty Responsibility:** Faculty members shall foster an expectation of academic integrity and shall notify students of their policy for the submission of academic work that has previously been submitted for academic advancement, as well as any special rules of academic integrity established for a particular class (e.g. whether or not a faculty member permits collaboration on homework) and make every reasonable effort to avoid situations conducive to infractions of the Code. An intentionally false charge of violation of the Code shall be treated as a violation of the Code or of the applicable University rules.

**Student Rights:** Students have the right to a fair consideration of the charges, to see the evidence, and to confidentiality as allowed by law and fairness to other affected persons. Except in the course of authorized consideration of a charge, faculty shall not reveal the identity of students charged or otherwise involved in a violation. Procedures under the Code shall be conducted in a confidential manner, although a student has the right to an advisor in any proceeding under the Code.

From the University of Arizona Student Policies, Procedures and Codes, <http://web.arizona.edu/~dos/uapolicies/cai1.html>

---

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR ON-LINE ETHICS TRAINING

---

### On-Line Module or Short Course in "The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects"

#### *The Least of My Brothers*

Funded by the [National Institutes of Health](#) (Grant Number 1 T15 AI07601)

*The Least of My Brothers* is an on-line module (or short course) in the ethics of research with human subjects. You may view more course information at the following web address: <http://poynter.indiana.edu/sas/lb/>, or you may also contact Kara Lochridge at: (812) 856-4968, or [klochrid@indiana.edu](mailto:klochrid@indiana.edu).

## Human Subjects Research Online Training, "Protecting Human Subjects" From the Department of Health and Human Services

This educational training series is designed to provide you with:

- Historical background for behavioral and biomedical research;
- Ethical principles for human subject research;
- Case studies;
- Information on the role of an Institutional Review Board (IRB).

### Background

As an Agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) has certain responsibility for the protection of participants in human research studies.

These responsibilities are mandated under HRSA's [Federalwide Assurance \(FWA\)](#) with the [HHS Office for Human Research Protections \(OHRP\)](#) as well as the Agency's own policy: [Program Protection of Human Subjects Participating in Research Programs Conducted or Supported by HRSA](#). The protections apply to studies conducted internally by HHS staff, as well as to external studies conducted by grantees and contractors.

If you are a HRSA staff member, researcher, grants and contracting official, grantee or someone outside the agency (including institutional officials, reviewers, students, investigators, or IRB members), you will find information provided in this training valuable.

### Getting Started

The HRSA Center for Quality and OHRP are pleased to provide you with this special training series.

The entire training should take you about 90 minutes to complete; however, you can complete each module independently of the others. Module 1 is 22 minutes. Module 2 is 28 minutes and Module 3 is 36 minutes.

**Module 1:** ["EVOLVING CONCERN: Protection for Human Subjects"](#)

**Module 2:** ["THE BELMONT REPORT: Basic Ethical Principles and Their Application"](#)

**Module 3:** ["BALANCING SOCIETY'S MANDATES: Criteria for Protocol Review"](#)

If you are interested in additional resources, you may find the [OHRP Institutional Review Board Guidebook](#) helpful.

The 1993 Guidebook is designed to assist IRB members research, and institutional administrators

in fulfilling their responsibilities for protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects as defined in the HHS regulations (45 CFR 46) entitled, "Protection of Human Subjects," revised June 18, 1991.

**Ethical Guidelines for  
Gifts to Physicians from Industry**

*Free educational modules now available*

The AMA's national initiative on *The Communication of Ethical Guidelines for Gifts to Physicians from Industry* is now offering four free online modules for CME credit. Each educational module is available in two formats:

- Online self-study for CME credit; and
- Downloadable resources educators can use to build one-hour learning experiences.

The educational modules will help satisfy Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) requirements for education on pro-fessionalism and industry professional relationships as well as similar requirements by the American Board of Medical Specialties.

Physicians can earn AMA PRA category 1 credit for the online self-study version. Local sites can issue CME credit for the classroom version of the downloadable educational modules.

For more information visit the following site:  
<http://www.ama-assn.org/ama/pub/category/8405.html>

---

**UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
RESEARCH AND SERVICE GROUP (RSSG)**

---

**UA HUMAN SUBJECT  
PROTECTION PROGRAM**

**≡Highlights≡**

**Coded Private Information  
or Biological Specimens\***

The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) recently released new guidance on **coded** private information or biological specimens. This article will discuss part of that guidance as it relates to research involving coded private information or specimens and when the research **is** or **is not** research involving human subjects, as defined under HHS regulations for the protection of human research subjects (45 CFR part 46).

For the purposes of this article, coded means:

- (1) identifying information (such as name or social security number) that would enable the investigator to readily ascertain the identity of the individual to whom the **private information** or specimens pertain

has been replaced with a number, letter, symbol, or combination thereof (i.e., code); and

- (2) a key to decipher the code exists, enabling the linkage of the identifying information.

Private information or specimens must be individually identifiable (i.e., the identity of the subject is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the information) in order for the information to constitute research involving human subjects.

However, when only coded private information or specimens are obtained, OHRP does not consider this human subjects research if the following conditions are **both** met:

- (1) the private information or specimens were not collected specifically for the currently proposed research project through an interaction or intervention with living individuals; and
- (2) the investigator(s) cannot readily ascertain the identity of the individual(s) to whom the coded private information or specimens pertain because, for example:
  - a. the key to decipher the code is destroyed before the research begins;
  - b. the investigators and the holder of the key enter into an agreement prohibiting the release of the key to the investigators under any circumstances, until the individuals are deceased
  - c. there are IRB-approved written policies and operating procedures for a repository or data management center that prohibit the release of the key to the investigators under any circumstances, until the individuals are deceased; or
  - d. there are other legal requirements prohibiting the release of the key to the investigators, until the individuals are deceased.

OHRP further recommends that institutions **designate** an individual or entity authorized to independently determine whether research involving coded private information or specimens constitutes human subjects research. The investigator does not have the authority to make this determination. At the University of Arizona, that entity would be the Human Subjects Protection Program office.

**NOTE:** Some HHS conducted or supported research involving coded private information or specimens may be subject to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations. The FDA regulatory definitions of human subject (21 CFR 50.3(g), 21 CFR 56.102(e) and subject (21 CFR 312.3(b), 21 CFR 812.3(p)) differ from the definition for human subject under HHS regulations.

\* Office for Human Research Protections. Guidance on Research Involving coded private information or biological specimens, 10 August 2004.

Access date 21 June 2005. World Wide Web <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/index.html#topics>.

### Reminder

#### New Videos Available on Human Protection

Three new training videos on the protection of human subjects have been made publicly available by the Health Resources and Service Administration in cooperation with the Office for Human Research Protections.

The videos may be access through the ORI home page by clicking on Human Subjects in the RCR resources section. The three videos run a total of 90 minutes.



### News from HIPAA.....

#### Frequently asked questions:

**Question:** May a *covered entity* disclose protected health information to a Protection and Advocacy system where the disclosure is required by law?

**Answer:** Yes. The Privacy Rule permits a covered entity to disclose protected health information (PHI) without the authorization of the individual to a state-designated Protection and Advocacy (P&A) system to the extent that such disclosure is required by law and the disclosure complies with the requirements of that law. 45 CFR 164.512(a). The Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (DD Act) provides for each state to designate a public or private entity as the Protection and Advocacy system to protect and advocate for the rights of individuals with developmental disabilities, including investigating incidents of abuse or neglect. The P&A designated pursuant to the DD Act is also the Protection and Advocacy

system for purposes of the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (PAIMI Act) and is empowered to protect and advocate for the rights of individuals with mental illness. These statutes and their implementing regulations require that access to records be provided to P&As under certain circumstances. See the DD Act at 42 USCA 15043(a)(2)(I) and (J) and the PAIMI Act at 42 USCA 10805(a)(4), and their implementing regulations at 45 CFR 1386.22 and 42 CFR 51.41, respectively. Thus, a covered entity may disclose PHI as required by the DD and PAIMI Acts to P&As requesting access to such records in carrying out their protection and advocacy functions under these Acts. Similarly, covered entities may disclose PHI to P&As where another federal, state or other law mandates such disclosures, consistent with the requirements in such law. Where disclosures are required by law, the Privacy Rule's minimum necessary standard does not apply, since the law requiring the disclosure will establish the limits on what should be disclosed. Moreover, with respect to required by law disclosures, a covered entity cannot use the Privacy Rule as a reason not to comply with its other legal obligations.

Section 164.512(a)(2) provides that in making a "required by law" disclosure about adult abuse, neglect or domestic violence (section 164.512(c)), for judicial or administrative proceedings (section 164.512(e)), or for law enforcement purposes (section 164.512(f)), covered entities must also comply with any additional privacy requirements in these provisions that apply. However, none of the additional procedural protections in sections 164.512(c), (e) and (f) apply to the type of "required by law" disclosures to P&As under the provisions of the DD and PAIMI Acts discussed here.

### University of Arizona – Animal Care Quality Care for Research Animals



#### Frequently asked questions....

**Question:** Why are increasing numbers of animals used in research?

**Answer:** The number of animals used in research has actually decreased in the past 20-25 years. Best estimates for the reduction in the

overall use of animals in research range from 20% - 50%. This reduction is more consistent and striking when comparing species. For example, best government estimates report that the number of cats used in research has dropped 66% since 1967. Due to a variety of factors, including the increase in nonanimal adjunct testing and the refinement of laboratory animal medicine, there are fewer animals used for many research projects.



## **Radiation Control**

### ***New Worker***

Radiation worker is a legal term that identifies any individual engaged in work with radiation who incurs a significant likelihood of radiation exposure during her or his work, whether as a part of their employment or their education and whether such work is an occasional or a principal activity. If this definition is applicable complete the Radiation Worker Data Sheet & Training Record ([RC-088](#)) with your Approval Holder, Lab Manager, or Supervisor and submit to the Radiation Control Office via campus mail, PO Box 245101, or hand deliver to 1717 E. Speedway, Suite 1201.

The Radiation Training Policy defines the comprehensive training policy for personnel associated with the use of radiation at the University of Arizona and University Medical Center.

Contact the Radiation Control Office for assistance at 626-6850 or [rcohelp@u.arizona.edu](mailto:rcohelp@u.arizona.edu).

The radiation safety policies that are currently available for the University of Arizona and University Medical Center may be found [here](#).

## **Institutional Biosafety Committee**



### **Bulletin**

**48 Annual Biological Safety Conference  
October 23-26, 2005**

**Westin Bayshore, Vancouver, British Columbia**

**[CALL FOR PAPERS](#)** ➤

**[PRELIMINARY ONLINE REGISTRATION](#)** ➤

**[AWARD NOMINATIONS](#)** ➤

**[HOTEL RESERVATIONS](#)** ➤

Local Arrangements Chair: [Bruce Anderson](#)

This site (address below) may be accessed between March 30, 2005 to October 27, 2005 to book, modify, or cancel a reservation.

<http://www.absa.org/confsem.html>

---

## **UPCOMING CONFERENCES/WORKSHOPS**

August 4-5, 2005

**Mentoring and Human Subjects' Protection**

Little Rock, AR

Co-sponsor: University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

October 1, 2005

**Plagiarism in the Science Disciplines: The Good, the Bad and the Really Ugly**

New York, NY

Co-sponsors: New York University Medical School, St John's University, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, City University of New York

October 7, 2005

**Promoting RCR in Research in the Social, Behavioral and Educational Sciences**

San Antonio, TX

Co-Sponsors: American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the University of Texas-San Antonio

October 16-19, 2005

**Society of Research Administrators (SRA) International Annual Meeting**

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

October 20-21, 2005

**Responsible Conduct of Research: Essentials for Research Success and Integrity**

Pocatello, ID

Co-sponsor: Idaho State University

October 25, 2005

**Promoting RCR in Research in the Social, Behavioral and Educational Sciences**

San Antonio, TX

Co-sponsors: American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the University of Texas-San Antonio

---

### **University of Arizona Program in Research Integrity Education staff:**

**Thomas P. Davis, Ph.D. (Program Director)**

Alice C. Langen, Director, Research Compliance

Ruth K. Daniels (Program Coordinator)

[rhk@u.arizona.edu](mailto:rhk@u.arizona.edu)

P.R.I.E. – Program phone number: (520) 626-6282

*The P.R.I.E. newsletter is compiled by Ruth Daniels.*

---

### *Words of Wisdom:*

*“People grow through experience if they meet life honestly and courageously. This is how character is built.”*

*Eleanor Roosevelt (1884-1962)*