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Academic Integrity: Competing pressures

- Increasing requirements from regulatory agencies
- Changes in communication technology
- Developing visual practices
- Rise in AI breaches

Research questions

1. How do HE institutions design and administer academic integrity education programs?
2. Are sanctions the most effective method to encourage completion?
3. Are the topics of assessment outsourcing and exam cheating being addressed?
4. What kinds of feedback opportunities are provided?
5. How should the next generation of academic integrity education programs be designed?
Methodology

Designing the study

Data collection
- Sampling and analysis procedures

Conducting the survey
- 80 questions
  - Quantitative and qualitative data
  - Number of participants: 65

Conducting the interviews
- Hour long interviews
  - Number of participants: 9

Analysis
- Purposeful sampling to remove institutional duplicates
  - Institutions: 44
### Institutions surveyed by country and type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Polytechnic/Institute</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Semi-structured interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling criteria</th>
<th>Possible participants</th>
<th>Identified participants</th>
<th>Actual participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program/university-wide/compulsory/sanctions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/university-wide/compulsory/ no sanctions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student program/not university-wide/not compulsory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student program/university-wide/ not compulsory</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student program/not university-wide/compulsory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either planning or thinking about program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program in place and not considering one</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Academic Integrity Program Status</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
<th>Proportion of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current program</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Currently implementing one</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Considering a program</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● No plan for a program</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program status unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program administration

(Wide range of administration approaches)

Completion rates ranged from ~30 -100%

- Centrally administered with compulsory completion = more efficient
  - better working knowledge of student completion rates
- 55% \((n = 16)\) did not know how many students complete it
- 28% \((n = 8)\) knew approximately
- 17% \((n = 5)\) knew accurately

\((N = 29)\) Institutions
Program design and assessment

~50% made the program compulsory for students \((N = 32 \text{ Institutions})\)

Location

- 59\% \((n = 19)\) stand-alone online module
- 16\% \((n = 5)\) within a unit of study
- 6\% \((n = 2)\) stand-alone unit of study

Assessment

- 63\% \((n = 20)\) had required assessment
- Most marked as pass/fail
- Students could retake as required
Opportunities for feedback

- Feedback - key factor positively influencing students’ understanding of AI (Barrett & Malcolm, 2006; Davis & Carroll, 2009)

- Only 25% specified program included activity with feedback on capacity to adhere to academic integrity standards
Sanctions

(N = 29 Institutions)

- 34% (n = 11) employ sanctions (withhold mark, block progression, etc.)
  - 73% (n = 8) of those believe sanctions work to promote completion

**BUT...** (N = 11 institutions)

- only 55% (n = 6) thought sanctions were effective in decreasing AI breaches
- 36% (n = 4) believed sanctions were slightly or not effective
- One institution did not know
Student Experience

\[ N = 32 \text{ Institutions} \]

- 56\% (\( n = 18 \)) believed students were **supportive** of completing the program
- 6\% (\( n = 2 \)) reported students were somewhat **hostile**

\[ N = 11 \text{ Institutions} \]

- 73\% (\( n = 8 \)) of institutions using sanctions indicated students were **supportive**
Topics covered in student AI programs

Proportion of institutions selecting topic

Plagiarism: 100%
Student responsibilities: 90%
Referencing: 90%
University rules and policies: 90%
Where to go for help: 90%
Cheating: 80%
Collusion: 80%
Paraphrasing: 70%
Ethical practice: 70%
Outsourcing assessments: 60%
Values: 60%
Risks to integrity: 60%

(N = 32 Institutions)
Next generation of AI education programs
Participants insights

“I don’t believe academic integrity should be addressed as an isolated program of learning...Academic integrity relates to a set of values and practices situated within disciplinary and professional communities of inquiry and practice...Staff need to induct students into the ethical challenges they will face as emerging scholars and practitioners in their disciplines and help them figure out how to navigate those.”
Considerations for next generation of programs

Future programs

Multifaceted

Value focussed

Collaborative
Conclusions

- Institutions use range of communication / administration strategies
  - centrally administered with sanctions effective for compliance
- Programs lacking comprehensive information on:
  - values, potential risks to integrity, and assessment outsourcing
- Current curriculum focusing on:
  - plagiarism, student responsibilities and referencing
- Next generation of training should be designed:
  - collaboratively, emphasise values, and adopt a multifaceted educational approach for skill development that incorporates learner feedback into the process
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