Wednesday 2:15pm – 3:30pm

Burren Suite (4th floor): Paper Session 1a

Chair: Kane Murdoch

Lorna Waddington and Olu Popoola	'Keeping ahead of the curve': Contract cheating checklist in 2023
Mads Goddiksen	AI detection blackens the dark side of plagiarism detection software
Yvonne Kavanagh, Aisling Reast and Sue Hackett	Developing a Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation & Case Management

Inis Mór 2: Paper Session 1b

Chair: Mairead Greene

Ruth Dooley	Research Integrity Training at University of Galway - A 5-year case study
Susan M.J. Berentsen and Fenneke Blom	Research integrity training for students (RITS project), lecturers, researchers and teams (TETRIAS project) at universities of applied sciences
Maura Hiney	The evolution of research integrity policy: from one-man-band to orchestra

Inis Mór 3: Paper Session 1c

Chair: Ann Rogerson

Haylee Fuller and Matthew Jones	What can Kant teach us about academic integrity? From JS Mill to the essay mill.
Irina Ruppo	Plagiarism versus Originality in Academia
Colm O Rourke	MTU Libraries: Meeting the Future of Research
Michelle Dalton	The role of academic libraries in supporting a culture of research integrity

Thursday 2:45pm – 4pm

Burren Suite (4th floor): Paper Session 2a

Chair: Sarah Elaine Eaton

Damien Raftery and P.J. Wall	Online quizzes and generative AI: impacts on the processes of learning and assessment
Miguel Nicolau, Michael O'Neill, Allen Higgins, Jenny Munnelly and James McDermott	On the Advantages of Computer-Based Examinations
Olumide Popoola and Heather McClean	Developing Academic Integrity Training for GTAs: Near Peers and Natural Advocates

Inis Mór 2: Paper Session 2b

Chair: Sue Hackett

Loretta Goff	Academic Integrity Education for Students and Staff: An Institutional Approach to Building a Culture of Integrity
Mary Heneghan and Eva Campion	Using Lego to instil academic integrity in undergraduate laboratory report writing.
Gwen Moore and Maria Varvarigou	Authentic Assessment and Meaning-Making in Teacher Education: Insights from Practice in Music Education

Inis Mór 3: Paper Session 2c

Chair: Serge Horbach

Ciara Egan	Open Scholarship in teaching and research: Opportunities and challenges for a more equitable academia
Karen Matvienko-Sikar, Aoife Coffey, Darren Dahly, Samantha Dockray, Catherine Houghton, Brendan Palmer and Elaine Toomey	The Principles and Practices of Open Research (PaPOR TRaIL) course: An open educational resource for open research:
Maura Hiney	When heroes fall: How can we prevent bias and dishonesty in research publications?
Hardy Schwamm and Aisling Coyne	Predatory Publishing – The dark side of Open Access?

Friday 10am – 11:15am

Burren Suite (4th floor): Paper Session 3a

Chair: Iain MacLaren

Allen Higgins, Miguel Nicolau, Niall Flaherty, Michael O'Neill, Jenny Munnelly and James McDermott	Strategies for "AI aware" assessment design/re-design
Sharon Lehane and Angela Wright	Improving Academic Integrity through Authentic Assessment Design
Monica Ward and Fiona O'Riordan	Five ways Interactive Oral assessments support Academic Integrity (even in the GenAI era)
Orna Farrell, Sinead Lynch & James Brunton	AI, Assessment and Academic Integrity

Inis Mór 2: Paper Session 3b

Chair: Justin Tonra

Kelly Ahuna, Loretta Frankovitch, Greer Murphy and Emily Perkins	Towards Longevity and Legitimacy in Academic Integrity Labor
Perry Share and Ruth Moran	Academic integrity and research integrity: a marriage made in heaven?
Daniel McSweeney	Making it count: Departmental Approaches to Establishing a Culture of Integrity in Teaching and Learning
Billy Kelly	What could be done? Exploring Irish higher education student views on ways in which the risk of succumbing to academic misconduct could be reduced/ avoided/ mitigated.

Inis Mór 3: Paper Session 3c

Chair: Mairéad Boland

Loretta Goff and Tadhg Dennehy	(AI)2ed: A Student-Staff Partnership on Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity in Learning, Teaching and Assessment Design
Elva Casey and Robin Flynn	Enabling a Culture of Student Partnership through an Academic Integrity Champions Network
Carina Ginty and Moira Maguire	Empowering students as academic integrity leaders: Lessons from the N-TUTORR project

Wednesday Session 1a

Lorna Waddington and Olu Popoola	'Keeping ahead of the curve': Contract cheating checklist in 2023
Mads Goddiksen	AI detection blackens the dark side of plagiarism detection software
Yvonne Kavanagh, Aisling Reast and Sue Hackett	Developing a Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation & Case Management

Keeping ahead of the curve': Contract cheating checklist in 2023.

Lorna Waddington (University of Leeds) and Olu Popoola (Queen Mary, University of London).

Abstract. In 2021 Popoola and Waddington led the design of the Contract Cheating Checklist for Markers. This resource was well received by the HE sector. However, the advent of generative AI powered by Large Language Models that can produce plausible academic content in minutes inevitably has ushered in a significant expansion of the potential to 'contract cheat'.

This paper presents a framework and initial findings for the development of a new Contract Cheating Checklist for Markers. It sets out to answer two broad research questions:

• To what extent do the red flags for commercial essay writing overlap with indications of generative AI use?

• How will the emergence of automated writing and content generation impact the use of essay mills and ghost-writing?

We utilise a mixed-method approach combining qualitative interviews, data science and ethnography.

• Social Listening: Internet research of forums and social media. Although these resources have proved useful for understanding contract cheating research so far, we will focus on the use of AI/ChatGPT/LLMs.

• Industry interviews: Interviews with commercial education providers specialising in academic misconduct detection or providing AI detection services to understand how their approach to ghostwriting/essay mill detection and AI content generation differs.

• Student voice. Student focus groups/vox pops to ascertain whether attitudes to commercial essay writing services have been impacted by AI/ChatGPT. This will be important to understand how the advent of AI affects the economics of the commercial essay writing industry in terms of student cheating decision-making processes.

• Forensic linguistics: Forensic linguistic comparison of AI-generated academic content with human commercially-written academic content. In this research, a comparison will be made between the commercially ghostwritten texts and AI-generated texts to help assess the extent to which these text styles overlap or are distinct - this will give clues as to the extent that these texts can be used in parallel.

• Community of practice: Through conducting a series of educator development workshops with staff involved with assessment design and delivery, we analyse the emerging sub-community of practice amongst assignment markers from an internal, emic perspective.

Key initial findings suggest that unauthorised use of generative AI tends to be for study support rather than wholesale assignment submission, that use of generative AI is generally not seen as unethical by students and their teachers, and that commercial essay writers appear to have adapted to the automation of their 'craft' by switching from writing to offering coaching and mentoring services. The impact on the existing Contract Cheating Checklist for Markers will be the focus of the presentation.

References:

Poopola et al., 'Contract cheating detection for markers: checklist [LSEAIN Contract Cheating Working Group], 2021 https://rise.articulate.com/share/dPC3F7wAQgeKahu71aUg0vBKfEUg8vsj#/lessons/6hD7HNjwZJ9vejUuxjmR5BsReX9s3au2

Keywords: Contract Cheating, Checklist for Markers, ChatGPT, Large Language Models, Essay Mills, Ghostwriters, Generative AI

AI detection blackens the dark side of plagiarism detection software.

Mads Goddiksen (Department of Food and Resource Economics).

Abstract. Plagiarism detection software has been a standard tool in the fight against plagiarism for several years. Many of these systems are now being expanded to also feature detection of AI generated text. In this talk, we will discuss the potential negative consequences of using plagiarism detection software, and how the efforts to enable detection of AI generated text may make these even more pronounced.

Revisiting interview and survey data on European (including Irish) undergraduate and upper secondary students' understanding and experiences with academic integrity [REFERENCE BLINDED], we will show that a substantial fraction of students worry about being accused of plagiarism based on automated checks even when they do not intentionally plagiarise. We show that these worries can lead students to focus more on not being caught than on good citation practice. This to an extent where some adopt citation practices that they believe are wrong in order to be safe in the automated checks. Further, we show that a major reason why students react in this way is that they do not understand how the plagiarism detection software, and the process in which it is used, work.

We argue that unless processes and communication are adequately updated, there is a substantial risk that the addition of AI detection to plagiarism detection software will make the processes and the software even more opaque to the students. This may in turn enhance the negative side effects of their use. Finally, we discuss how teachers and institutions may adequately meet this challenge.

Keywords: Plagiarism, AI, Plagiarism detection software

Developing a Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation & Case Management.

Yvonne Kavanagh (South East Technological University), Aisling Reast (RCSI) and Sue Hackett (QQI).

Abstract. The National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) in Ireland was formed in 2019, with the aim of developing a national approach to academic integrity.

NAIN promotes a positive and inclusive approach to academic integrity but an important aspect of this work involves developing guidance for a structured approach to dealing with the investigation and management of academic misconduct. The Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation and Case Management was developed through a consultative and iterative process involving input from all actors across higher education in Ireland.

The lifecycle of academic misconduct was investigated, and the important phases identified. Guided by national and international best practice, three consultation papers were developed and distributed for consultation to NAIN members. The feedback received informed the development of a comprehensive framework. The next stage involved circulation of the draft framework to both internal and external stakeholders. This comprehensive and detailed feedback was analyzed, and the framework finalised.

This framework for academic misconduct investigation and case management is important in the development of a clearly understood process and provides a platform to ensure uniformity of approach across higher education institutions in Ireland.

References:

NAIN: https://www.qqi.ie/what-we-do/engagement-insights-and-knowledge-sharing/national-academic-integrity-network

Keywords: academic, integrity, misconduct, framework, investigation

Wednesday Session 1b

Ruth Dooley	Research Integrity Training at University of Galway - A 5-year case study
Susan M.J. Berentsen and Fenneke Blom	Research integrity training for students (RITS project), lecturers, researchers and teams (TETRIAS project) at universities of applied sciences
Maura Hiney	The evolution of research integrity policy: from one-man-band to orchestra

Research Integrity Training at University of Galway - A 5-year case study.

Ruth Dooley (University of Galway).

Abstract. Research Integrity Training at University of Galway - A 5-year case study

Dr Ruth Dooley, Office of the Vice-President for Research, University of Galway

The University of Galway has a comprehensive programme of training in place for Research Integrity. Training in Research Integrity is available to all research staff and students and we provide a mixture of online self-paced learning, in-person interactive workshops and online webinars. In 2018, the national funding bodies introduced mandatory training for funded Principal Investigators and their team members. A nationwide consortium of ~30 Research Performing Organizations (RPOs), including University of Galway, was formed to develop a training programme, under the National Research Integrity Forum (NRIF)1 and in collaboration with the national funders. Following a 3-year pilot training initiative, the online training programme has now been rolled out nationwide. In Galway, the programme comprises online self-paced training, complimented by the delivery of interactive workshops covering University of Galway policies and procedures in relation to Research Integrity and including group work exercises and activities.

The post-graduate ECTS module in Research Integrity was developed in collaboration with the Graduate Studies Office at University of Galway in 2017. The Centre for Research in Medical Devices (CÚRAM) initially spearheaded the introduction of the module for ECTS credits, in collaboration with and based on the University College Dublin model. After a series of workshops specifically designed for researchers working in the medical device field, the module was later opened up to all disciplines, based on a discipline-specific online course and interdisciplinary workshop. Online training in Research Integrity has recently been made mandatory for all new post-graduate researchers at University of Galway and forms part of their progression criteria at the annual Graduate Research Committee meeting.

This short talk presents an overview of our experience and findings over the past 5 years in delivering training in Research Integrity to all levels of researcher – from post-graduate researchers to academic staff. We will cover the evolution of integrity training at University of Galway, from the roll-out of self-paced online training to the development and tailoring of interactive workshops to suit multiple disciplines, as well as the incorporation of current best practice and novel teaching methodologies through EU initiatives such as VIRT2UE2 and Path2Integrity3 train the trainer programmes. In collaboration with the Researcher Development Centre4, we have collected comprehensive feedback from workshop participants over the years. In this talk, we will share our insights on what works well in integrity training, what elements/approaches were found to be most beneficial to participants and ideas for future development.

References:

National Research Integrity Form: Research Integrity | Irish Universities Association (iua.ie)

VIRT2UE: Virtue based ethics and Integrity of Research: Train-the-Trainer program for Upholding the principles and practices of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity | VIRT2UE | Project | Fact sheet | H2020 | CORDIS | European Commission (europa.eu)

Path2Integrity: Path2Integrity - Path2Integrity

Researcher Development Centre: Researcher Development Centre - University of Galway

Research integrity training for students (RITS project), lecturers, researchers and teams (TETRIAS project) at universities of applied sciences.

Susan M.J. Berentsen (HAN University of Applied Science) and Fenneke Blom (Amsterdam UMC).

In recent years, the authors have developed training programmes on research integrity (RI) for universities of applied sciences (UAS) in the Netherlands. They propose a step-by-step approach [1] which was used to set the agenda of RI training programmes using the insights of the target group. A training programme on RI for and with UAS students was developed within the RITS1 project. The training programme equips lecturers with tools to teach students how to recognize and address moral issues in applied research. After a pilot among students, parallel to their applied research project, the participating students were interviewed to evaluate the content of the course material and their learning outcomes. The TETRIAS2 project – whereby researchers from different Dutch UAS have been interviewed about their experiences with RI and their needs for training in RI - resulted in a basic individual training and a more advanced team training. The basic training focuses on basic knowledge in RI, creates awareness of dilemmas in RI and empowers participants to initiate dialogues about RI. Research teams, research ethics committees or groups with a joint mission can attend the advanced team training, which aims to collaboratively design actions (based on shared values) that increase awareness of RI issues in applied research, promote skills and tools to discuss RI and develop a research culture that fosters RI. For further information visit the website www.tetrias.eu. This paper session will cover the general design and content of the various training programmes on research integrity, as well as the trainers' and participants' experiences with these training programmes.

References:

Blom F, Berentsen SMJ, and van der Sande R. 2022. How to set the agenda for training in responsible conduct of research using the target audience as a narrative guide. FACETS 7: 1258–1275. doi:10.1139/facets-2021-0048

[1] Research Integrity Training for Students

[2] Translating researchers' Experiences into Training on Research Integrity at universities of Applied Science

The evolution of research integrity policy: from one-man-band to orchestra.

Maura Hiney (Institute for Discovery, University College Dublin).

Abstract. From humble beginnings at the 1st World Conference on Research Integrity in 2007, research integrity policy has evolved to match our growing understanding of the importance of environmental factors in incentivising good and bad behaviours. The policies and processes developed by institutions, funders and journals can have a significant influence on behavioural change at an institutional and individual level. These policy interventions are motivated by the ambition of ensuring research excellence and an unsullied research record; continuing societal support for public investment in research; avoidance of harmful impacts and research waste; and enhanced economic advancement.

While the ultimate responsibility for good research practice lies with individual researchers, we increasingly recognise that ensuring research integrity is a shared task that requires a holistic approach, given its linkages with other aspects of the research system, such as academic integrity, access to publications and data, research careers, evaluation, peer review, and research collaboration. This presentation will trace the evolution of policy responses to the ever-changing research landscape through the themes of the eight World Conferences on Research Integrity, spanning 18 years, and the five influential policy statements* that emerged from these conferences. It will look at the impetus for each statement, its key messages and the impacts the statements have had on emerging research integrity thinking at national and international levels.

• Singapore Statement of Research Integrity Principles (2010)
https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement

• Montreal Statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Collaboration (2013)
https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/montreal-statement

• Amsterdam Agenda for Research on Research Integrity (2017)
https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/amsterdam-agenda

• Hong Kong Principles for Assessing Researchers (2020) https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/hong-kong-principles

• Cape Town Statement on Fostering Integrity through Fairness and Equity (2023)
https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/cape-town-statement

Keywords: Research integrity, Policy development, Research environment

Wednesday Session 1c

Haylee Fuller and Matthew Jones	What can Kant teach us about academic integrity? From JS Mill to the essay mill.
Irina Ruppo	Plagiarism versus Originality in Academia
Colm O Rourke	MTU Libraries: Meeting the Future of Research
Michelle Dalton	The role of academic libraries in supporting a culture of research integrity

What can Kant teach us about academic integrity? From JS Mill to the essay mill.

Haylee Fuller (Queen Mary University of London) and Matthew Jonnes (University of Greenwich).

Abstract. This paper explores contemporary issues relating to academic integrity through the lens of two dominant ethical approaches – deontology and teleology.

The paper draws together the expertise of an academic misconduct practitioner with an interest in ethical theory, and a political philosopher with an interest in academic integrity. One presenter is the Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office, dealing with hundreds of academic misconduct cases on a daily basis. The other presenter is a Senior Lecturer in Politics & International Relations with an interest in academic integrity and assessment design, who is concerned about the changing nature of the misconduct he has identified in students' work. Through these shared experiences and expertise, they will apply the ethical frameworks of deontology and teleology to explore thought experiments on "wicked problems" in academic misconduct policies and procedures. The presentation invites the audience to collaboratively work through these thought experiments as they delve into the complexities and challenges that arise.

This paper contributes to the debates on the rapidly changing nature of both academic integrity and higher education. As such, it touches on issues relating to the challenging realities of the student experience, and more broadly the academic misconduct industrial complex and the neo-liberal university.

The paper reflects on the lessons that can be taken forward when developing contemporary academic misconduct practices and policies that are themselves grounded in ethics and integrity. These reflections suggest a rethink of the traditional rules-based procedural approaches to academic integrity still followed in many institutions, in favour of broader consideration of the complexities and consequences for higher education, students, and academic communities.

Keywords: academic integrity, ethics, deontology, teleology, policies, procedures, students

Plagiarism versus Originality in Academia.

Irina Ruppo (University of Galway).

Abstract. What is Originality in Academic Writing?

While the precise relationship between student originality and plagiarism is yet to be defined, these concepts are inter-related (Salmons, 2008). It is thus possible that by paying more attention to the meanings of the term originality, a potentially desirable quality, we might gain a better perspective on the phenomenon we would wish to eradicate.

However, in contrast to the vast body of work dedicated to the concept of plagiarism (Pecorari, 2022), originality in student writing is under-researched. Existing research points to issues with lack of clear definitions (Eaton, 2021; Howard, 2000) and lack of consistency and consensus across the academic community (Borg, 2009; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). This lack of consensus means that students' and academics' approaches to originality may differ.. Moreover current approaches to originality are likely to be affected by the semantically novel use of the term in submission and plagiarism detection software such as Turinitin. The concept is further challenged by the recent emergence of AI within the educational sphere.

This paper will consider possible future approaches to student originality by drawing on the research into student conceptions about writing (Lavelle, 1993) as well as the concept of authorial identity in student writing (Cheung et al., 2017; Cheung et al., 2018).

References:

Borg, E. (2009). Local plagiarisms. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34(4), 415-426.

Cheung, K. Y. F., Stupple, E. J. N., & Elander, J. (2017). Development and validation of the Student Attitudes and Beliefs about Authorship Scale: a psychometrically robust measure of authorial identity. Studies in Higher Education, 42(1), 97-114.

Cheung, K. Y. F., Elander, J., Stupple, E. J. N., & Flay, M. (2018). Academics' understandings of the authorial academic writer: A qualitative analysis of authorial identity. Studies in Higher Education, 43(8), 1468-1483.

Eaton, S. E. (2021). Plagiarism in higher education: Tackling tough topics in academic integrity. ABC-CLIO.

Howard, R. M. (2000). Sexuality, textuality: The cultural work of plagiarism. College English, 62(4), 473-491.

Lavelle, E. (1993). Development and validation of an inventory to assess processes in college composition. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63(3), 489-499.

Pecorari, D. (2022). Plagiarism and English for academic purposes: A research agenda. Language Teaching, 1-15.

Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. Journal of Second Language Writing, 21(2), 149-164.

Salmons, J. (2008). Expect originality! Using taxonomies to structure assignments that support original work. In Student plagiarism in an online world: Problems and solutions (pp. 208-227). IGI Global.

Keywords: plagiarism, originality, academic writing, authorial identity

MTU Libraries: Meeting the Future of Research.

Colm O Rourke (Munster Technological University).

Abstract. This 10 minute presentation will focus on MTU Libraries and our pro-active engagement in the promotion of academic integrity among undergraduate students across the MTU Bishopstown Campus. It will take into consideration learning support initiatives that have been ongoing since 2016, giving an overview of our commitment to ensuring students acquire the skillsets necessary to good research practice.

Specifically, the presentation will focus on the development and roll-out of MTU Libraries Assignment Toolkit, an Open Educational Resource (OER) created in partnership with students and the Department of Technological Enhanced Learning (TEL) at MTU.

The Assignment Toolkit is an online resource with a suite of 8 modules covering all aspects of the research process, created to meet the various difficulties students encounter when working on assignments.

Included in the OER are 4 modules covering topics such as Critical Thinking, Misinformation/Disinformation, Plagiarism and Referencing. With the advent of ChatGPT and other AI platforms, these specific modules have now begun to take on a more central relevance, one that was largely unforeseen when the OER was in development.

During Semester 1 of the 2022/23 academic year, the Library worked closely with 4th year students on their final year literature review project, using the Assignment Toolkit as a guide to developing research methods. These tutorials took place each week and enabled Library staff to better identify student strengths and weaknesses in their approach to research but also in terms of their awareness of issues surrounding academic integrity.

In the next academic year MTU Libraries intend to embed the Assignment Toolkit with a 2nd year group of Marketing and to use the opportunity as a means to re-imagine the OER as resource that can help these students to further develop key critical thinking skills, to discuss the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in assignments, to raise awareness around the topics of misinformation and disinformation and discuss how this will impact on their undergraduate research, prospective careers and life more generally.

Libraries have always adapted to technological shifts and trends and while the advent of Artificial Intelligence technologies will pose many challenges, its potential benefits to research and learning will be embraced by Libraries. In this regard, MTU Libraries will be no different. As a Library we are cognisant of the challenges AI poses to research, but we will continue to strive to better educate and guide students in using these and other online platforms with absolute integrity.

Keywords: Library, Learning Support, Open Education Resource, Teaching and Learning, Assignment, Undergraduate students, Academic Integrity, Critical Thinking, Plagiarism, Referencing, Misinformation, Disinformation

The role of academic libraries in supporting a culture of research integrity.

Michelle Dalton (University College Dublin Library).

Abstract. In recent years significant changes in the academic publishing landscape, such as the acceleration of Open Access, new and innovative forms of scholarly dissemination, and an emerging focus on the responsible use of research metrics, have brought both challenges and opportunities for research integrity.

Urgent global crises like Covid-19, climate change, and the SDGs have precipitated increased public interest in research and the growth of citizen science, generating diverse and broader audiences far beyond the walls of the academy. In parallel with this, the growth of preprints, the continued rise of so-called "predatory publishers", and the reducing role of publisher as "gatekeeper", mean some of the traditional proxies for assessing quality & trust in the scholarly record are changing. In this context, building a culture of research integrity and enabling public trust in the research process have become even more important than ever before.

Libraries are an active partner in many of these challenges - for example through the provision of open access publishing options, research data management and stewardship, and advocating for responsible research evaluation. By working together with relevant stakeholders across the research community, libraries and librarians can help inform solutions to some of the new and complex questions we face in the research environment today, such as:

-How can we best leverage the benefits of open research and research data management to drive and enable research integrity and validation?

-How do we ensure the research system measures and incentivises the right things to reward research integrity and ethical practice, as well as the appropriate recognition of authorship and broader contributions?

-What can we do to help ensure public trust in the scholarly and scientific record amidst an increasing number of retractions?

-How do we help our users and communities to recognise when to trust information, when to question and probe more deeply, and further still, to take on the responsibility to actively advocate for ethical practice and integrity?

-How can we support our students, researchers and citizens to understand the research ecosystem and the publishing processes behind it, to enable them to source, use, and communicate research and information ethically?

This presentation will discuss some of these questions, and highlight how libraries can help to support and enable a culture of research integrity through empowering our communities to navigate today's information environment as digitally and research literate citizens.

Keywords: Open Research, Research Data Management, Academic Libraries, Trust

Thursday Session 2a

Damien Raftery and P.J. Wall	Online quizzes and generative AI: impacts on the processes of learning and assessment
Miguel Nicolau, Michael O'Neill, Allen Higgins, Jenny Munnelly and James McDermott	On the Advantages of Computer-Based Examinations
Olumide Popoola and Heather McClean	Developing Academic Integrity Training for GTAs: Near Peers and Natural Advocates

Online quizzes and generative AI: impacts on the processes of learning and assessment.

Damien Raftery (South East Technological University) and P.J. Wall (South East Technological University).

Abstract. As generative AI (artificial intelligence) technologies, such as ChatGPT, become increasingly available, traditional online assessments must be re-evaluated to maintain their educational value. Open-book online quizzes have long been an effective tool for engaging students, effectively supporting learning (Angus and Watson, 2009), and reinforcing fundamental knowledge and skills (Lyng and Kelleher, 2019). However, the ease of using AI to complete online quizzes may undermine their intended purpose, with ChatGPT's accuracy improving from the modest performance on multiple-choice questions reported last February by Newton (2023).

Recent informal discussions about generative AI with my students indicate there is a small but growing awareness with little admitted use. Malmström, Stöhr, and Ou (2023), in a survey of Swedish university students undertaken mostly in April 2023, found that almost all are familiar with ChatGPT with more than a third using it regularly. Thus, for the current academic year 2023 – 2024, it is likely that most of my students will (be able to) use generative AI tools.

This presentation will report the initial findings of using ChatGPT to answer twelve online quizzes used for continuous assessment in two first-year quantitative techniques modules on business programmes in an Irish technological university. This investigation was undertaken in May 2023 with ChatGPT-3.5, ChatGPT-4 and ChatGPT with Wolfram plugin (as ChatGPT can be poor at arithmetic, the Wolfram plugin significantly improves the performance of calculations). The details will be presented, but the overall conclusion is that the online quizzes on these modules can be quickly completed with the assistance of ChatGPT with a high level of success.

The implications of this for using online quizzes as an assessment strategy will be discussed; potential assessment redesigns will be outlined, including how to thoughtfully integrate generative AI into the learning and assessment process in an ethical and constructive manner. Access to generative AI does not mean students will no longer need to be able to solve problems, develop mathematical and statistical literacy, and do calculations. Although generative AI provides a challenge to traditional online quizzes, it also has the potential to aid student comprehension and learning, and the skills of prompt engineering are likely to become increasingly relevant and useful.

References:

Angus, S. D. & Watson, J. (2009). Does regular online testing enhance student learning in the numerical sciences? Robust evidence from a large data set. British Journal of Educational Technology, 40(2), 255-272. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2008.00916.x

Lyng, C. & Kelleher, E. (2019). Engaging large cohorts of students in online formative assessment to reinforce essential learning for summative assessment. AISHE-J, 11(1), 1-21. https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/366

Newton, P. M. (2023, February 21). ChatGPT performance on MCQ-based exams. https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/sytu3

Malmström, H., Stöhr, C. & Ou, A. W. (2023). Chatbots and other AI for learning: A survey of use and views among university students in Sweden. Chalmers Studies in Communication and Learning in Higher Education, 1. https://doi.org/10.17196/cls.csclhe/2023/01

Keywords: Generative AI, ChatGPT, Online quizzes, Retrieval practice

On the Advantages of Computer-Based Examinations.

Miguel Nicolau (University College Dublin), Michael O'Neill (University College Dublin), Allen Higgins (University College Dublin), Jenny Munnelly (Technological University Dublin) and James McDermott (University of Galway).

Abstract. The arrival and free availability of AI systems, particularly Large-Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, has caused panic in most third level education institutions. In some cases, it has forced those institutions to rethink computer-based assessment [1], whereas in more extreme cases, it has forced a resurgence of pen-and-paper examinations [2].

Yet there are very clear advantages to computer-based assessment over handwritten examinations [3]. We present a framework put in place for a cohort in excess of 350 students in University College Dublin (UCD), regarding their end-of-delivery examination. The examination consists of a quiz in Brightspace, the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) used in UCD. Brightspace and other widely used VLEs (Blackboard, Moodle, Canvas, etc) all provide support for online examinations, including access to very detailed logs, which allow for extremely rich real-time and post-delivery analytics.

These tools and data provide clear benefits for student assessment, particularly for in-classroom, computer-based examinations:

- Creation of unique examinations for each student (through scrambling of question order, question options, and/or providing each student with unique variations of questions);

- Inter-student plagiarism detection (easily detectable correlated answers);

- Better examination design (easy analysis of difficulty/discrimination of questions, better examination timing management, etc);

- Difficulty and grade prediction (using question banks from past examinations, the difficulty of examinations can be fine-tuned for specific cohorts);

- Consistency of grading (most quiz-based questions can be automatically graded, and even long answer questions are easier to read/grade, reducing errors and biases from the grading process);

- Comfort for students (most students are more comfortable typing than handwriting [4]);

- Accessibility and Universal Design (computer-based quizzes provide many advantages for students with special needs, such as screen-reading software, speech-to-text tools, etc);

- Easier support for open-book / open-web examinations;

- Potential for provision of detailed feedback to students (potentially automatable).

There are undoubtedly some challenges that need careful consideration as well:

- Careful invigilation is required to control access forbidden material (particularly if students are using their own computers);

- Room requirements (ample bandwidth, power plugs, etc);

- Dealing with technical difficulties (non-starting/crashing/non-responsive computers, etc).

Despite the challenges, the deployment of such computer-based examinations has been a repeated success with the UCD module, for both students and instructors. We will present detailed analytics, and discuss the future challenges that tools like LLMs pose (and how to address them).

References:

www.irishtimes.com, Trinity advises academics to adjust assignments in light of ChatGPT cheating threat, https://www.irishtimes.com/ireland/education/2023/01/27/trinity-advises-academics-to-adjust-assignments-in-light-of-chatgpt-cheating-threat, accessed June 2023

www.theguardian.com, Australian universities to return to 'pen and paper' exams after students caught using AI to write essays, https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/10/universities-to-return-to-pen-and-paper-exams-after-students-caught-using-ai-to-write-essays, accessed June 2023

Balogh, J. (2016) A Practical Guide to Creating Quality Exams. Intelliphonics, LLC

www.theguardian.com, Handwriting vs typing: is the pen still mightier than the keyboard?, https://www.theguardian.com/science/2014/dec/16/cognitive-benefits-handwriting-decline-typing, accessed June 2023

Keywords: assessment design, academic integrity, computer-based examinations, LLMs, ChatGPT, learning technology

Developing Academic Integrity Training for GTAs: Near Peers and Natural Advocates.

Olumide Popoola (Queen Mary University of London) and Heather McClean (Queen Mary University of London).

Abstract. Increasingly, teaching at university is being conducted by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). Their role involves not only planning and teaching but also assessing, grading and giving feedback on submissions. GTAs typically get very little training in assessment processes: while they may receive guidance on using assessment criteria and providing feedback, they rarely receive training on academic integrity. Any knowledge they possess about this area is likely to come from their experience as learners (i.e., doctoral students) students rather than as instructors. Compounding this is the fact that GTAs are also far less likely to have access to Continuous Professional Development opportunities or access to up-to-date developments in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)) e.g., educational developments regarding academic integrity and Artificial Intelligence.

This lack of training and development means that GTAs may be particularly vulnerable to student academic misconduct. Research in the US suggests that cheating is 32% more likely in classes taught by GTAs (Seals et al., 2014).

This presentation will describe the results of qualitative research undertaken at a research-intensive UK university to understand GTA perceptions of academic integrity. A mixed-mode approach was used, employing questionnaires, focus groups and semi-structured interviews with 23 GTAs.

Key findings exposed worrying gaps in knowledge regarding a wide range of common academic misconduct, such as collusion, self-plagiarism, and citation/reference list padding - despite most GTAs expressing a high level of confidence in their knowledge of general academic integrity rules.

At the same time, GTAs were aware of their lack of knowledge about the university's academic integrity policies and processes, often learning about them only after they had encountered academic misconduct. This reactive approach meant that GTAs, while understanding the social/psychological reasons behind cheating, were more focused on describing academic misconduct than promoting academic integrity. This was in stark contrast to GTA perceptions of research integrity, which was very much associated with values and culture rather than rules and regulations.

The presentation will report on how the findings have been used to develop an innovative GTA training module that supports GTAs to construct a professional identity as academic champions whilst developing their knowledge of institutional governance of academic integrity; it will argue that, as near-peers and research integrity specialists, GTAs have a unique status within the university which they can utilise to promote and enhance institutional academic integrity from a grassroots level.

References:

Seals, M., Hammons, J., & Mamiseishvili, K., 2014. Teaching Assistants' Preparation for, Attitudes towards, and Experiences with Academic Dishonesty: Lessons Learned International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 26 (1) pp26-36

Thursday Session 2b

Gwen Moore and Maria Varvarigou	Authentic Assessment and Meaning-Making in Teacher Education: Insights from Practice in Music Education
Loretta Goff	Academic Integrity Education for Students and Staff: An Institutional Approach to Building a Culture of Integrity
Mary Heneghan and Eva Campion	Using Lego to instil academic integrity in undergraduate laboratory report writing.

Authentic Assessment and Meaning-Making in Teacher Education: Insights from Practice in Music Education.

Gwen Moore (Mary Immaculate College) and Maria Varvarigou (Mary Immaculate College).

Abstract. Contested approaches and philosophies in the discipline of music (Elliott, 1995) and the product-process continuum within creative arts programmes can give rise to learner disaffection (Kleiman 2017). In the context of general teacher education, students may have varied levels of experience of engagement in discipline-specific practices of music-making, potentially compounding assumptions and values in relation to creativity and the purpose and role of music in education. In this presentation, we share insights from authentic assessment design and innovative approaches to real-world practices in group music-making and learning. We argue that discipline-specific learning and assessment strategies are critical to meaning-making processes for learners in their development as musicians and as student teachers. In particular, we will share strategies for the collaborative design and implementation of authentic assessment within music education modules that promote innovative approaches underpinning principles of assessment as learning (O'Neill, 2017). Consequently, we share insights and vignettes from practice in relation to possibilities for 'meaningful' authentic assessment (McArthur, 2021) in the context of generalist teacher education. We will conclude by considering multiple perspectives on authentic assessment in arts education from scholarly literature that can inform future practice in the arts/music in higher education.

References:

Elliott, D. (1995) A Philosophy of Music Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kleiman, P. (2017) 'We don't need those learning outcomes: assessing creativity and creative assessment' in Elkington, S. & Evans, C. (Eds.) Transforming Assessment in Higher Education: case studies York: Higher Education Academy

McArthur, J. (2023). Rethinking authentic assessment: work, well-being and society, Higher Education, Vol. 85:1, pp.85-101.

O'Neill, G. (2017). Enhancing Programme Approaches to Assessment and Feedback in Irish Higher Education: Case Studies, Commentaries and Tools. National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5113939.v5

 Keywords: Authentic Assessment, Creativity, Music Education, Assessment as learning

Academic Integrity Education for Students and Staff: An Institutional Approach to Building a Culture of Integrity.

Loretta Goff (University College Cork).

Abstract. The aim of University College Cork's institutional approach to academic integrity is to create an environment that fosters it, focusing in the first instance on a developmental educational approach (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020) that supports student success rather than solely punitive measures. To achieve this environment, consistent modelling of academic integrity, underpinned by joined-up communications, is required at all levels of the institution, from our leadership to our academic and professional service staff, and our students. In this paper, the results of a research collaboration between the student-facing Skills Centre and the staff-facing Centre for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning that laid the groundwork for this developmental approach will be shared. The results of this project include the creation of resources, training opportunities, and events for both staff and students that clearly demarcate academic integrity and academic misconduct in order to focus on skill development, facilitate engaged learning, and encourage student and staff understanding, partnership and shared responsibility. The teaching and learning approach to academic integrity (Eaton, 2020; Morris, 2016) that informed this project will be illustrated through specific examples of project work that that highlight the importance of a shared understanding across student and staff populations and demonstrate how resources and trainings in were developed in support of this, including an evaluation of the impact of these measures. In addition, the work carried out in this project will be situated within the national context, demonstrating alignment with objectives laid out by Ireland's National Academic Integrity Network (2021). The practice examples of academic integrity education shared in this paper, along with the impacts of these, will be particularly beneficial for conference attendees who may be interested in implementing some of these approaches themselves.

References:

Bertram Gallant, T. & Stephens, J. M. (2020) Punishment Is Not Enough: The Moral Imperative of Responding to Cheating With a Developmental Approach, Journal of College and Character, 21:2, 57-66, DOI: 10.1080/2194587X.2020.1741395

Eaton, S. E. (2020). Understanding Academic Integrity from a Teaching and Learning Perspective: Engaging with the 4M Framework. Calgary: University of Calgary. http://hdl.handle.net/1880/112435

Morris, E. J. (2016). Academic Integrity: A Teaching and Learning Approach. In T. Bretag (Ed.), Handbook of Academic Integrity (pp. 1037–1053). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_11

National Academic Integrity Network (2021). Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms. Available at: https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-11/academic-integrity-national-principles-and-lexicon-of-common-terms.pdf (Accessed: 9 March 2023)

Using Lego to instill academic integrity in undergraduate laboratory report writing.

Mary Heneghan (ATU Sligo) and Eva Campion (ATU Sligo).

Abstract. Report writing in a laboratory setting is a fundamental skill required by all science undergraduate and postgraduate students. While this skill is essential and transferable to the workplace, it is extremely challenging for students to master. Often, report writing is perceived as complicated; students do not know how to approach the task, get frustrated, and this frequently leads to decreased academic integrity. Having taught L6-L9 laboratory sessions for over 10 years, we have observed more plagiarism issues in laboratory report assessments than any other assignment. Strategies to increase academic integrity often focus on policies of enforcement i.e., outlining penalties associated with academic misconduct. Our objective is to develop strategies to enable student success in report writing, and concurrently embed academic integrity in a positive and constructive manner.

This study describes the implementation of a report writing workshop with L6 undergraduate students studying a 10-credit laboratory module. Our approach focused on scaffolding, feed forward and fading to empower students to master this task. A second-year cohort was selected for the study as we felt it was important to develop these skills early. Prior to the workshop, students completed a laboratory experiment and subsequently submitted a report. The experiment and its associated report were intentionally designed to be relatively uncomplicated and straight forward to document. A tutorial, which included guidance on plagiarism, was delivered to the students before submitting their reports. Additionally, a written guide to report writing, a Harvard referencing guide, and a rubric mark scheme, were provided to support the students in this assessment. Following submission, a comprehensive workshop was conducted where students initially self-assessed their own report and a range of sample reports that were provided to them. During the workshop the concept of plagiarism was taught in an innovative way using Lego. The grading process for the sample reports provided was explained and discussed in detail. Following this process students then reassessed their own reports. Individual grades as assessed by academic staff and written feedback were also provided during the workshop. Students were given the opportunity to reflect on their learning and resubmit the same report for academic assessment.

Student feedback on the workshop was extremely positive "This class was highly informative"; "Practical examples of real reports made it easy to relate to your own work"; "This course should be offered to first and second years"; Using Lego helped visualise plagiarism". Notably, the class confidence level in report writing rose by 23% after completion of the workshop. In addition, the impact on academic performance was dramatic. The class average GPA increased by 47% upon resubmission of the report, while the class average Turnitin similarity score decreased by 20%. Furthermore, when students were then challenged with a more complicated experiment and associated report, the class average GPA increased by 30% as compared to their original submission, while the class average Turnitin similarity score decreased by 11%. Following the success of this workshop we intend to expand on this research and implement this report writing strategy across other programs.

Thursday Session 2c

Ciara Egan	Open Scholarship in teaching and research: Opportunities and challenges for a more equitable academia
Karen Matvienko-Sikar, Aoife Coffey, Darren Dahly, Samantha Dockray, Catherine Houghton, Brendan Palmer and Elaine Toomey	The Principles and Practices of Open Research (PaPOR TRaIL) course: An open educational resource for open research:
Maura Hiney	When heroes fall: How can we prevent bias and dishonesty in research publications?
Hardy Schwamm and Aisling Coyne	Predatory Publishing – The dark side of Open Access?

Open Scholarship in teaching and research: Opportunities and challenges for a more equitable academia.

Ciara Egan (University of Galway).

Abstract. Open Scholarship has quickly become a major focus in research and funding policy both nationally and internationally, with the aim that it may help research integrity, and combat reproducibility issues across various fields. Within the open scholarship community there is a consensus that education centred on reproducibility and open methods at undergraduate level will be beneficial for both the research community and the learners. A simultaneous discussion is happening around the inequalities that are perpetuated within academia. This talk will outline some of the issues currently facing academics, and how these impact on both research and teaching. It will then look at the ways in which a cultural shift towards open science/scholarship could be used to foster better research (cf. Elsherif et al., 2022) and teaching environments (Pownall et al., 2023). Consideration will also be given to the challenges that hinder such progress, including academic incentive structures, the possibility that current inequalities will persist in a more open system, and the potential for the work of opening science to fall on already marginalised academics.

Keywords: Open Scholarship, Open Science, Research Integrity, Equality and Inclusion

The Principles and Practices of Open Research (PaPOR TRaIL) course: An open educational resource for open research.

Karen Matvienko-Sikar (University College Cotk), Aoife Coffey (University College Cork), Darren Dahly (Health Research Board Clinical Research Facility Cork, University College Cork), Samantha Dockray (University College Cork), Catherine Houghton (University of Galway), Brendan Palmer (Health Research Board Clinical Research Facility Cork, University College Cork) and Elaine Toomey (University of Galway).

Abstract. Background: Open research involves actions at all stages of the research cycle to make research processes and outputs more transparent and accessible. Developing educational resources for students is essential to enhance awareness and early engagement with open research practices, and promote a culture of research integrity. A number of initiatives exist for researchers at PhD, post-doctoral and more senior levels to support teaching and learning of open research. However there is a critical need for development of educational resources for research students at earlier career stages in their research journeys, namely undergraduate and postgraduate students. As such, the aim of the PaPOR TRaIL project was to develop an open educational resource (OER) on open research for undergraduate and postgraduate students, the PaPOR TRaIL course.

Methods: To understand student and research supervisor attitudes, knowledge, and experiences of open research, as well as needs and preferences for open research educational content and delivery, we conducted interviews and surveys. Students were recruited from University College Cork and supervisors were recruited across institutions in Ireland. Findings from interviews and surveys were integrated with international guidance on best practice in open research to develop the PaPOR TRaIL course. The preliminary course was user-tested by students and supervisors, who provided feedback to enable refinement of the course prior to its launch in December 2019.

Findings: Inconsistencies in open research knowledge and attitudes were observed in interviews with 16 students and 14 supervisors. Surveys completed by 74 students and 76 supervisors, indicated perceptions of importance of open research and preferences for course content (e.g., reproducibility, open data) and delivery (e.g., videos, templates). Following this, the PaPOR TRaIL course was developed as an OER to include a stand-alone introductory module, and six optional follow-on skills-based modules on specific open research practices. The six practice-based modules cover: Research Integrity; Pre-registration; Research Data Management; Reproducible Practices; Open Reporting; and Knowledge Dissemination. Following user-testing by five students and three research supervisors, the course was refined and finalised. Since its launch in December 2019, nearly 500 students from 15 countries have enrolled in the course.

Discussion: The PaPOR TRaIL course is an evidence-based OER that provides a comprehensive foundation in open research theory & practice. PaPOR TRaIL promotes development of core research values and equips students with transferable competencies and skills, including how to conduct, consume, and use research in a trustworthy and ethical manner. The PaPOR TRaIL course promotes openly accessible and transparent teaching and research, which have important benefits for individuals, society, and research and academia.

https://open.ucc.ie/browse/all/cpd/courses/papor-trail-principles-and-practices-of-open-research-003cpd

When heroes fall: How can we prevent bias and dishonesty in research publications?

Maura Hiney (Institute for Discovery, University College Dublin).

Abstract. What makes research valuable to society? The intellectual contribution of the research community is vital to understanding how our physical, social, political and cultural environment works and what will enhance it. It leads to the development of ideas, policies and innovations that impact and improve the quality of our daily lives. Therefore, the activities of researchers and the outputs of their endeavours touch every part of society, so it is critical that society can trust those outputs to be true and unbiased. That society includes fellow researchers, who rely on the truthfulness of the research record, the foundation upon which advances are built, to make progress in their field and add to the store of knowledge worldwide. Bias and dishonesty in research publications turn the research record into a house of cards.

Therefore, addressing bias and dishonesty in research reporting is vital. Through the lens of an example of a personal fallen hero, this presentation will look at some evidence for the level of bias and dishonesty in publications and ask what can be done to prevent this. What is the evidence for better research through methods such as pre-registration, registered reports, pre-submission review, open peer review and open data? Can the widespread uptake and implementation of these methods improve the quality, validity and credibility of reporting in the research literature, and how might this change the face of scholarly publication in the future?

Predatory Publishing – The dark side of Open Access?

Hardy Schwamm (University of Galway) and Aisling Coyne (TU Dublin).

Abstract. Predatory journals are regarded as a global threat to science. These journals are characterised by "false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency". Their threat to research integrity is that they claim to perform peer review and editorial procedures but in reality, any article will be published without quality checks if payments are made. Articles in such journals have been found in systematic reviews and were referenced by policy documents.

Involved are not only authors from low- and middle-income countries but also high- and upper-middle-income countries such as Ireland. Motivations to publish in these journals are, from being unaware of the predatory nature of the journal to intentionally ignoring research integrity in order to publish.

There is another effect of predatory journals on the Open Access movement. Predatory behaviour is sometimes described as the "dark side" of Open Access. It is true that predatory publishers work with an Author Pays model in the same way that many Open Access journals use an Article Processing Charge (APC) as their business model. This leaves many authors confused and anxious about publishing Open Access when there might be a risk to their integrity and reputation.

This paper will look at two aspects: How big is the threat of predatory publishers on research integrity (spoiler alert: in some disciplines significant!) and what can be done to minimise the impact of fraudulent actors in Open Access publishing? We will also look at how the Open Access movement can act to uphold principles of integrity, transparency and accessibility when it is faced the unintended consequences of bad actors in the OA ecosystem.

References:

Grudniewicz, A., Moher, D., Cobey, K., Bryson, G., Cukier, S., Allen, K., . . . Lalu, M. (2019). Predatory journals: No definition, no defence. Nature (London), 576(7786), 210-212. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03759-y

Predatory behaviour in publication ethics. COPE, 25 May 2023. https://publicationethics.org/news/predatory-behaviour-publication-ethics

Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences. IAP, 2020. https://www.interacademies.org/publication/predatory-practices-report-English

Allen Higgins, Miguel Nicolau, Niall Flaherty, Michael O'Neill, Jenny Munnelly and James McDermott	Strategies for "AI aware" assessment design/re-design
Sharon Lehane and Angela Wright	Improving Academic Integrity through Authentic Assessment Design
Monica Ward and Fiona O'Riordan	Five ways Interactive Oral assessments support Academic Integrity (even in the GenAI era)
Orna Farrell, Sinead Lynch & James Brunton	AI, Assessment and Academic Integrity

Strategies for "AI aware" assessment design/re-design.

Allen Higgins (University College Dublin), Miguel Nicolau (University College Dublin), Niall Flaherty (University College Dublin), Michael O'Neill (University College Dublin), Jenny Munnelly (Technological University - Dublin) and James McDermott (University of Galway).

Abstract. Education is at an inflection point prompted by the proliferation of, and challenges created by AI, large language model/chatbots, and related technologies. While the availability of new AI technology poses challenges for all types of assessment, the challenge is particularly acute for online exams. The paper considers strategies for "AI aware" assessment re-design in general and for online exams in particular.

In the post-COVID-19 era online delivery of learning and assessment has become normalised without necessarily addressing the need to thoroughly safeguard academic integrity (Camage et. al, 2020). Online exams increase the risk of cheating in a number of ways (collusion, impersonation, access to disallowed resources etc.). Online proctoring or invigilation (Baume et al, 2021) offer a partial solution but are subject to resource constraints (availability of qualified people, software, computer, network, camera, etc.).

We provide a map of the assessment landscape, linking the range of exam inputs/outputs with examination types (e.g. essays, MCQs, OSCEs, recitals etc.). The map is used to identify assessment risks and remedies that satisfy the need for evidenced, empirical, authentic, human-produced, person-linked, examination artefacts. Examinations are judgements of competence subject to or performed within certain constraints. The conventional exam is represented by the student working alone in a controlled environment writing answers to questions on an exam paper within a time limit. In order to pass, the student must convince the examiner that they have attained the required level of competence in a skill, ability, or a body of knowledge such that they can apply it to real situations with adequate mastery. In general terms, an examination involves the student performing a task or responding to questions subject to defined constraints. All examinations operate under constraints: constrained by scope (setting the examination tasks); available time; allowed supports (e.g. instruments, implements for writing, typing, calculating etc.); examination objects (media, samples, etc.); and not to forget the availability of others who produce the examination setting including the examiner(s), proctor/invigilator(s), assistants and others.

We then discuss the potential for three complementary approaches to safeguard online exams:

1. Personalised exams generated from question-banks (unique questions per student).

2. Intensive proctoring/invigilation (digital and in-person).

3. Control of the physical in-person environment (isolated network, firewall, faraday cages, air-gapped computers).

We conclude by asking what the impact will be if teachers and institutions take these factors into consideration in the design of teaching, learning and examination spaces? Our hope is that the findings, recommendations, and conclusions made in this paper will be used for the design of new physical and virtual examination environments that respond to and future-proof against growing challenges to computer-based assessment, for example, UCD's plan to build a new multi-function sports building plus examination centre (UCD, 2023).

Improving Academic Integrity through Authentic Assessment Design.

Sharon Lehane (Munster Technological University) and Angela Wright (Munster Technological University).

Abstract. ChatGPT has sent alarm through the higher education community since its release in November 2022. The chatbot, powered by artificial intelligence (AI), has created new and complex issues around academic integrity, and added to existing concerns in relation to contract cheating. Assessment design has been heralded as a potential solution to address the emergent problem of new cheating practices, and there is widespread belief that incorporating authenticity into assessment design can be particularly effective.

With the changing landscape of Higher Education, and the necessity to deliver 'employment ready' graduates, authentic assessment has emerged as a mechanism that can provide an ideal opportunity for students to develop the professional skills which are required for today's complex workplace. The development of these employability skills, however, is contingent on students being held to the highest academic standards as part of assessment practices. Promoting authenticity and academic integrity in assessment, therefore, is a continuing priority for higher education institutions.

It is proposed that authentic assessment design, when coupled with supportive teaching and learning environments and strong student-lecturer relationships, can assist with the prevention and detection of new cheating practices, while also minimising opportunities to cheat. In this context, the relationship between authentic assessment and academic integrity is investigated in this paper. The benefits of authentic assessment for academic integrity are analysed, and an optimal design for authentic assessment is proposed.

This paper contributes to the emerging body of literature on assessment design and academic integrity by examining the claim that authentic assessment can assure academic integrity and minimise academic misconduct. There is a lack of empirical evidence to support this claim and the current study aims to address this gap in the literature. A systematic literature review was conducted to investigate the relationship between authentic assessment and academic integrity, and 32 papers from 2019 to 2023 were chosen for review based on the focus of these studies and their relevance to the topic.

This paper provides a robust Model for Practice which guides the implementation of authentic assessment in such a way that simultaneously improves academic integrity. The novel research outcomes promote the development of methodologies by which authentic assessment, academic integrity and Higher Education practices can be significantly advanced and will benefit future HE Institutional policy and practices.

References:

Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., van Haeringen, K. and Rozenberg, P. (2019).

Contract cheating and assessment design: Exploring the relationship. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 44(5), 676–691. doi:10.1080/02602938.2018.1527892

Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., Rozenberg, P., Newton, P., and Saddiqui, S. (2020). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. Higher Education Research and Development. doi:10.1080/07294360. 2019.1680956

Harper, R., Bretag, T. and Rundle, K. (2021). Detecting contract cheating: examining the role of assessment type. Higher Education Research and Development, 40(2), 263-278. doi:10.1080/07294360.2020.1724899.

Sotiriadou, P., Logan, D., Daly, A. and Guest, R. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. Studies in Higher Education, 45(11), 2132-2148. doi:10.1080/03075079.2019.1582015.

Keywords: Authentic Assessment, Assessment Design, Academic Integrity, Contract Cheating, Academic Misconduct

Five ways Interactive Oral assessments support Academic Integrity (even in the GenAI era).

Monica Ward (Dublin City University) and Fiona O'Riordan (Dublin City University).

Abstract. Academic Integrity is a core element of education and it is particularly important in Higher Education assessment, where methods of assessment differ from primary and secondary level education. While closed-book, time-limited, invigilated exams (traditional exams) are one of the main ways of examining students, they are not the only ways. The Covid-19 pandemic forced academics to rethink their assessment practices and many innovative approaches were adopted. While some/many academics have reverted to traditional exams, some academics have chosen to use other assessment approaches. While these alternative approaches may be good for authenticity and student engagement, they are now facing a new threat with the release of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools to the general public.

One innovative approach to assessment is Interactive Oral (IO) assessment. It is a two-way, free flowing conversation between an assessor and students (Sotiriadou et al., 2020). It is not a viva-type formal question and answer examination nor an oral exam. There are no direct questions with a right or wrong answer. It is based on a professional scenario and the interaction is founded on natural curiosity. Conversation prompts facilitate students showcasing their learning. It promotes higher order thinking and is a viable, alternative, authentic assessment method

There are five ways in which IO assessments support Academic Integrity. It is synchronous and it can either be in-person or online. This means that students' learnings will be demonstrated in real-time. It is transparent, with students being provided with rubrics and a recording of a relevant sample IO assessment as part of the scaffolded IO process. It is authentic in that it is based on a real-world situation that the students will encounter (e.g. initial teacher educators discussion approaches to literacy or computing students working in a software consultancy). IO assessments are adaptive in that the conversation will adapt to what the students are saying - it is not a pro-forma, one size fits all, approach. Finally, IO assessments are personalised to each student's context and this encourages adherence to Academic Integrity.

While there may be some circumstances in which a student can engage in academic misconduct during an interactive oral assessment, in most cases it is probably slightly harder (and maybe not worth the effort) for a student to circumvent this synchronous, transparent, authentic, adaptive and personalised assessment approach (even in the GenAI era). There are challenges in that it takes time to plan and design the IO assessment in advance, but it is worth it. In summary, this presentation looks at Interactive Oral (IO) assessment and how it can support Academic Integrity, even in the GenAI era.

References:

Sotiriadou, P., Logan, D., Daly, A., & Guest, R. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. Studies in Higher Education, 45(11), 2132-2148.

Keywords: Interactive Oral Assessment, Academic Integrity, Generative Artificial Intelligence

AI, Assessment and Academic Integrity.

Orna Farrell, Sinead Lynch & James Brunton (Dublin City University).

Abstract. The emergence of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT and DALL-E pose a challenge to the academic integrity of traditional higher education assessment approaches (Glesson, 2022). However, this challenge is also an opportunity to innovate and evolve higher education assessment to be more authentic, creative and inclusive. In response to this challenge, Higher Education Institutions (HEI) need to develop awareness and understanding of generative AI tools and how to design assessment which preserves academic integrity whilst harnessing the opportunities to innovate assessment and harness the potential of AI tools for educational good (QQI, 2023).

This paper will share insights from the recently funded DCU cross-faculty project: Artificial intelligence, Assessment and Academic Integrity. The aim of this cross-faculty collaborative and interdisciplinary project is to raise awareness and build capacity in the DCU community about the challenges and opportunities presented by generative AI tools in relation to assessment and academic integrity. Specifically, the project will research, design, develop and deliver digital resources and professional learning offerings to upskill DCU staff and students on how to design assessment and do assessment which takes account of these new technologies and the key principles of assessment design: validity, reliability and fairness.

Project website https://sites.google.com/dcu.ie/aiandassessment/home

Keywords: AI, Assessment, Academic integrity

Friday Session 3b

Kelly Ahuna, Loretta Frankovitch, Greer Murphy and Emily Perkins	Towards Longevity and Legitimacy in Academic Integrity Labor
Perry Share and Ruth Moran	Academic integrity and research integrity: a marriage made in heaven?
Daniel McSweeney	Making it count: Departmental Approaches to Establishing a Culture of Integrity in Teaching and Learning
Billy Kelly	What could be done? Exploring Irish higher education student views on ways in which the risk of succumbing to academic misconduct could be reduced/ avoided/ mitigated.

Towards Longevity and Legitimacy in Academic Integrity Labor.

Kelly Ahuna (University at Buffalo), Loretta Frankovitch (University at Buffalo), Greer Murphy (University of Rochester) and Emily Perkins (Syracuse University).

Abstract. Anecdotal and empirical data indicate that on some U.S. campuses, academic honesty and integrity (hereafter, AI) professionals are seen to exist for little more than issuing sanctions and punishing students, their purpose(s) deemed reactionary, and their expertise devalued. On other campuses, AI professionals are seen to provide important intellectual labor, helping students understand and apply the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, respect, fairness, and courage (ICAI, 2022) and advising faculty on how to guide students into better decision-making and ethical completion of their academic coursework. These disparate views correspondingly affect and are affected by institutional structures such as budgets, reporting lines, and opportunities for professional advancement, as well as institutional cultures and climates around integrity work.

Overall, in AI, there exists a current, pressing need to more clearly define not just the "spaces" that house this work, but also the people who do it and the scholarly and practical expertise they bring. Therefore, this presentation will share preliminary results of a qualitative study using semi-structured interviews with AI professionals and document-based analysis. The study investigates how AI both manages and is managed within U.S. higher education, profiling 10-12 AI scholar-practitioners who operate in distinct university settings, each possessing varying level(s) of formal preparation for the roles they inhabit and coming to AI work from faculty or staff backgrounds (or, in some cases, from both). Through an institutional-ethnographic approach (LaFrance, 2019; LaFrance & Nicolas, 2012) this study compares the daily working lives of these professionals, analyzing how job descriptions and other institutional texts acknowledge or erase their labor.

The aims of this research are two-fold: (1) to provide embedded, on-the-ground insight as to how AI practitioners build intellectual capital and credibility while fitting into their respective campuses; and (2) to illustrate the affordances and limitations of existing conceptual frames to describe AI work. These themes are brought into deliberate conversation, yielding insights on the differences between what AI job descriptions capture and what they exclude, and between how academic integrity roles are perceived versus what the work actually entails. In foregrounding the various ways AI professionals have made sense of their labor, this study analyzes and reflects how these calculations have affected and will continue to affect scholar-practitioners' sense(s) of institutional belonging—as well as the personal, emotional, and professional sustainability of AI work.

Particularly, this presentation will address: opportunities and challenges in how institutions acknowledge and quantify the labor of AI staff; the variety of ways AI staff have worked through structural-material and institutional-cultural constraint(s) to build intellectual capital and credibility and to begin establishing communities of practice; and how academic integrity as a profession can and should work to prepare incoming/continuing staff and thus further cement its longevity and legitimacy.

Academic integrity and research integrity: a marriage made in heaven?

Perry Share (Head of Student Success, Atlantic Technological University), Ruth Moran (Graduate Education and Research Integrity Officer, Atlantic Technological University)

Abstract. As the title of this conference suggests, academic integrity [AI] and research integrity [RI] have the potential to be linked. The reality is that, for historical, institutional and discursive reasons, they have tended to emerge and develop in separate worlds. This presentation addresses the question: can, or should, they be brought together?

The emergence of artificial intelligence poses fundamental questions for the integrity of higher education, as do other forces such as commercialisation, shifting political support for HE, the influence of rankings and changes in the publishing and funding environment. In response, is it best to develop a common approach to AI and RI, for example within an overarching approach to HE integrity, as suggested by Eaton (2023). Alternatively, are there good reasons to maintain the separation of the two fields. Perhaps the ideal solution lies somewhere between these two? What are the implications of each approach?

These are interesting academic questions, but they also have ramifications for how HEIs organise their integrity activities, including policies, procedures, supports and sanctions. 'New' institutions, such as Ireland's technological universities, have a particular opportunity to explore new ways to address integrity issues. Internationally a small number of HEIs have linked RI and AI. It can be difficult, without further investigation, to measure the extent to which this is reflected in practices on the ground.

This exploratory paper includes:

- a brief overview of some of the key forces in the HE environment that challenge integrity

- the existing principles that underpin academic and research integrity – where these overlap and where they might differ

- the benefits and challenges of linking AI and RI

- a brief review of HEIs that have connected AI and RI, and how they have done

- a potential way forward, in terms of research

Reference

Eaton, S. E. (2023). Comprehensive academic integrity (CAI): An ethical framework for educational contexts. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), Handbook of Academic Integrity (2nd ed.). Cham: Springer

Making it count: Departmental Approaches to Establishing a Culture of Integrity in Teaching and Learning.

Daniel McSweeney (Technological University Dublin).

Abstract. This paper provides an overview of the experiences of an academic head of department in their efforts to establish and strengthen a culture of integrity in teaching and learning. It explores six key areas: the importance of policy in guiding practice, the role of technology, barriers to effective cultures of integrity, recording and retention of data, staff development and support, and reputational damage and unforeseen consequences.

University and national policy provide a foundational element in both the establishment and support of cultures of academic integrity. However, critical gaps may emerge between the intention of policy and the actuality of implementation. Drawing on case studies, the paper provides insights into the tension filled realities of interpreting and operationalising integrity policy.

The enactment of integrity policy is routinely aided by technology, and in particular, established and emergent plagiarism detection tools. While technology can be instrumental in combatting plagiarism and academic dishonesty, issues such as poor technology implementation, over reliance on technology based decision making, or shortcomings in user competence, can hinder efforts to maintain academic integrity. The paper will also discuss the downsides of technology and in particular, recent experiences of generative AI technologies and the significant impact that these systems have had on our approaches to assessment and academic integrity.

The paper will also explore barriers to establishing and maintaining cultures of integrity. Case studies presented will highlight several barriers including generative AI, academic workloads, policy awareness, student communications, technological competence, the risk of reputational damage, academic stress, and management support.

The recording and management of case data is an essential consideration when operationalising academic integrity within academic structures. Decisions on data storage, access and security, and GDPR, can impact on the fairness, transparency, rigour, and trustworthiness of an integrity culture.

Effective cultures of academic integrity are also reliant on an academy which are aware of policy, informed of best practice, committed to action, and supported by management in the course of their practice. Investment in staff development and support is a key element in any culture of integrity. This paper will outline examples of support and how they assisted staff in their academic integrity practice.

Lastly, the paper discusses the repercussions of reputational damage, both for individuals and the collective. Incidents and investigations into academic integrity can bring into focus the academic's assessment practices and their adherence to policy. In some cases, outcomes of integrity investigations can be damaging for academics and their standing with colleagues. The paper will also discuss how the success of the academic department in the tackling of academic integrity led to reporting in national print media and perceived reputational damage.

In summary, this paper provides valuable insights into the experiences of an academic head of department in endeavours to establish and strengthen a culture of integrity in teaching and learning. It addresses the key areas of policy, technology, barriers, data management, staff development, and reputational damage, offering case examples and highlighting the importance of these factors in maintaining academic integrity within our higher educational environment.

Keywords: Barriers, Culture, Integrity, Technology, Reputation, Data retention

What could be done? Exploring Irish higher education student views on ways in which the risk of succumbing to academic misconduct could be reduced/ avoided/ mitigated.

Billy Kelly (National Academic Integrity Network).

Abstract. During February and March 2023 as an optional component part of the annual national survey of student engagement, StudentSurvey.ie, students from seven higher education institutions (HEIs) completed a Topical Module on Academic Integrity. Respondents were first and final year undergraduate students and taught postgraduate students.

That module sought scaled answers to 15 closed-ended questions and a final open-ended question, In your view, what more could institutions do to help students avoid engaging in academic misconduct?

This presentation will present a content analysis of over 3,500 answers to that open-ended question. It will offer insights into student perceptions of the effectiveness of current institutional policies and processes related to academic misconduct gained from these responses, and will flag potential amendments or innovations to current procedures recommended by students, that HEIs might adopt.

The student perspectives on a number of interlinked themes will be explored- namely
  • the scope of what constitutes academic misconduct;
  • the effectiveness of current educative approaches to academic integrity;
  • contextual factors that may contribute to academic misconduct;
  • assessment design, preparation, and related instruction factors which may be drivers to academic misconduct;
  • deterrence of academic misconduct.

Findings will be explored in the context of existing research on student perspectives of academic integrity including, Bens (2022); Bretag et al (2014); Mahmud et al (2019); Packalen & Rowbotham (2022); and Sefcik et al (2020).

References:

Topical Module on Academic Integrity, https://studentsurvey.ie/sites/default/files/users/user27/Topical%20Module%20on%20Academic%20Integrity_English.pdf

Bens, S. L. (2022). Helping students resolve the ambiguous expectations of academic integrity. In Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge (pp. 377-392). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Bretag, Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2014). "Teach us how to do it properly!" An Australian academic integrity student survey. Studies in Higher Education (Dorchester-on-Thames), 39(7), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406

Mahmud, Bretag, T., & Foltýnek, T. (2019). Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism Policy in Higher Education: a Comparison of the United Kingdom, Czechia, Poland and Romania. Journal of Academic Ethics, 17(3), 271–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9319-0

Packalen, K. A., & Rowbotham, K. (2022). Student insight on academic integrity. In Academic Integrity in Canada: An Enduring and Essential Challenge (pp. 353-375). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Sefcik, Striepe, M., & Yorke, J. (2020). Mapping the landscape of academic integrity education programs: what approaches are effective? Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 45(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1604942

Friday Session 3c

Loretta Goff and Tadhg Dennehy	(AI)2ed: A Student-Staff Partnership on Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity in Learning, Teaching and Assessment Design
Elva Casey and Robin Flynn	Enabling a Culture of Student Partnership through an Academic Integrity Champions Network
Carina Ginty and Moira Maguire	Empowering students as academic integrity leaders: Lessons from the N-TUTORR project

(AI)2ed: A Student-Staff Partnership on Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity in Learning, Teaching and Assessment Design.

Loretta Goff (University College Cork) and Tadhg Dennehy (University College Cork).

Abstract. While generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools represent a serious threat to academic integrity when used inappropriately, they also present an opportunity for digitally enhanced learning, teaching and assessment. Our research project – (AI)2ed: Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity – brings together colleagues from across the University, including policymakers, library staff, academics, and students to develop guidance on the ethical use of AI (enhancing learning, not bypassing it) in higher education, critical information literacy and practice examples of innovative modes of teaching, learning and assessment that incorporate these tools across disciplinary contexts. Several recent publications in the rapidly evolving area of AI and higher education offer information for educators on what AI is and how generative AI and large language models work, along with best practice guidance on ethical use (i.e., Foltynek 2023; Moya 2023; Webb 2023). However, of these, few offer specific practice examples, particularly in terms of different disciplines and modes of assessment, and few have been developed in collaboration with students, centering the student voice to identify exciting opportunities offered by these new technologies. Our project, using ChatGPT as an exemplar of generative AI, considers how it can be used as an assistive tool, without foregoing independent thought, analysis, and intended learning. Importantly, to arrive at our findings, a project team of students recruited from across disciplines (as well as adult learners, international students and those registered with Disability Support Services) were paired with a team of academic staff using a students-as-partners approach. These student-staff teams experimented with ChatGPT using samples of standard current assessment tasks from their disciplines to evaluate how ChatGPT responded to prompts based on these and to consider if and where AI could be incorporated ethically, as well as what mode of assessment best matched intended learning outcomes. The result of this collaborative evaluation is a toolkit for the ethical use of AI tools in learning and teaching that builds on the aforementioned publications on the topic to not only provide clear guidance on maintaining academic integrity when using AI, but also discipline-specific case studies of good practice highlighting innovative inclusive assessment design that reflects the changing landscape of higher education. In this paper, we will discuss our project methodology and results, sharing key guidance and case studies from the toolkit.

References:

Eaton, S. E. et al. (2023) Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity: The Ethics of Teaching and Learning with Algorithmic Writing Technologies. OSF. doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/4CNVP.

Foltynek, T. et al. (2023) "ENAI Recommendations on the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in Education". International Journal for Educational Integrity (19)12. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00133-4

Moya, B. et al. (2023). "Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education Contexts: A Rapid Scoping Review Protocol." Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, 5(2), pp. 59-75. doi: https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.75990

Webb, M. (2023) "A Generative AI Primer". Jisc, National centre for AI. 11 May. Accessed at: https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2023/05/11/generative-ai-primer/#3-2-1

Enabling a Culture of Student Partnership through an Academic Integrity Champions Network.

Elva Casey (Hibernia College) and Robin Flynn (Hibernia College).

Abstract. This presentation outlines the establishment of a college-wide Community of Practice (CoP) on Academic Integrity, and the subsequent collective policy review process and development of an Academic Integrity Champions Network (AICN) with the dual function of promoting an academic integrity culture at programme level and positively enabling students found to have engaged with academic misconduct to address the issues. The open format of the CoP and student consultation process (through focus groups, semi-structured interviews, CoP participation) exposed the potentially punitive nature of academic integrity policies. Literature speaks to a situation whereby university policies are broadly aligned in their educative and punitive approaches to academic integrity, however where scope exists for development in terms of policy access and supports (Möller, 2022). The CoP directed focus towards the need to co-create student supports, resulting in an in-depth review and re-development of college policies - (informed by Bretag et al.'s (2011) five core elements of exemplary policy) and further to co-creation of resources to support students in their own practices, thus authentically engaging students with academic integrity practices.

The conceptual framework presented by Wenger et al. (2011) for promoting and assessing value creation in communities and the cycle of value creation was utilised by the CoP. Lave and Wenger's (1991) CoP, focused on situated learning in a safe and participatory space, further informed the work and facilitated the sharing and testing of ideas with a focus on Academic Integrity to provide inspiration and energy to make positive impacts (Eaton et al., 2021).

The AICN model is supported by the work of Kaposi and Dell (2012) which highlights the transitional nature of the HEI sector as focus moves from punitively penalising academic misconduct and towards improving supports. They argue for a rejection of assumptions of moralistic approaches towards suspected intentions of misconduct which impede transparency of interpretation and result in overly simplified renditions of student identity as honest/dishonest. The AICN model encourages students to develop as critical thinkers. Bretag et al. (2013), hold that students need to move beyond the basic provision of information and towards holistic approaches which authentically engage them with Academic Integrity practices, instilling both good practice and promoting a sea change in student mindset regarding good practice of academic integrity. The overarching purpose of the network is thus to provide one-to-one, tailored support for students found to have engaged in academic misconduct and co-plan a pathway to better and sustainable academic practices.

References:

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2013). "Teach us how to do it properly!" An Australian academic integrity student survey. Studies in Higher Education, 39(7), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. (2011). Academic Integrity Standards: A preliminary analysis of the academic integrity policies at Australian universities. Refereed paper presented at the Australian Quality Forum 29 June-1 July, Melbourne, Australia.

Eaton, S.E., Figueroa, B.M., Butterworth, C., Feledichuk, D., Leslie, K., Lothian, J., Murray, J., Sodeen, C. & Wheatley, B. (2021). Reflections on the First Year of Integrity Hour: An Online Community of Practice for Academic Integrity. Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity 4(1). https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v4i1.72676

Kaposi, D., & Dell, P. (2012). Discourses of plagiarism: moralist, proceduralist, developmental and inter-textual approaches. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 33(6), 813–830. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.686897

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Möller, A. (2022). An analysis of university academic integrity policies in New Zealand, Journal of Further and Higher Education, 1-13. DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2022.2130195

Wenger, E., Trayner, B. & de Laat, M. (2011). Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: a conceptual framework. Rapport 18, Ruud de Moor Centrum, Open University of the Netherlands https://wenger-trayner.com/resources/publications/evaluation-framework/

Keywords: Academic Integrity, Student Partnership, Community of Practice, Punitive Academic Integrity Policies, Academic Misconduct, Student Support, Collaborative Practice

Empowering students as academic integrity leaders: Lessons from the N-TUTORR project.

Ginty Carina (ATU) and Moira Maguire (Dundalk Institute of Technology).

Abstract. The National Technological University Transformation for Recovery and Resilience (N-TUTORR) programme is a partnership between the technological universities, institutes of technology and THEA. It aims to transform the student experience by empowering students and staff and developing sustainable digital ecosystems. Funded under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan, the project is a response to global uncertainty and seeks to enhance capacity of the sector to meet this and future challenges in our transition to a sustainable future.

The project is organised around three principal work streams:

- Transform the student experience through learner empowerment.

- Transform learning teaching and assessment by developing staff capabilities,

- Enable digital ecosystems to transform learning, teaching and assessment.

A number of cross-cutting priority themes are addressed in each stream: Academic Integrity, Digital Transformation, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, Sustainability, and Universal Design for Learning.

This presentation will focus on the work of the learner empowerment stream to partner with students to promote a culture of academic integrity across the sector. It will highlight 3 key initiatives that empower students to act as leaders in academic integrity:

The 'Partners in Innovation' Fellowship scheme funds student-staff partnerships to enhance the student experience by addressing one or more of the priority themes within partner institutions. 131 partnerships have been supported, involving over 400 students and staff. The presentation will explore the approaches taken by these partnerships to address academic integrity challenges.

100 Student Champions have been recruited across the 7 partners to provide leadership and act as change agents in their own institutions and beyond. They will support engagement with a 'Student Digital Backpack'. This offers a range of digital badges, including an Academic Integrity badge, which will be piloted with 1st years across partner institutions from September 2323. Some of these Champions will explain how they are being empowered and supported to do this with respect to academic integrity.

The presentation will reflect on the progress so far, challenges and lessons learned and will consider the implications for student partnership and student leadership in academic integrity more widely.

Keywords: academic integrity, N-TUTORR, student-staff partnership, Student leaders