Friday Session 3a

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).

Keywords: online examination, authentic assessment, AI aware assessment, examination framework

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.

Keywords: quantifying labor, administration, professionalization, institutional ethnography

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

Keywords: culture of integrity, Technological University, academic integrity, research integrity, values, good practice

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

Keywords: academic misconduct, student perspective, policy effectiveness, policy communication

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

Keywords: artificial intelligence, academic integrity, inclusive assessment design, ChatGPT, students-as-partners

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