Transcript for FLO Panel: Educative Approaches to Academic Integrity (March 1, 2023)
BCcampus event hosted March 1, 2023
Host: Helena Prins
Facilitator: Dr. Anita Chaudhuri
Panelists: Dr. Subrata Bhowmik, Dr. Anita Lam, Beatriz Antonieta Moya, and Dr. Laurie McNeill

HELENA PRINS:
Well, good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for joining us this morning, the 1st of March. And also our first ever Facilitating Learning Online panel with today's topic of Educative Approaches to Academic Integrity. My name is Helena Prins, and it's my privilege to host you this morning. I'm an advisor here in the Learning and Teaching team at BCcampus. And our team hopes to have a quarterly FLO panel on some heart and trendy topics in post-secondary education and facilitation practices. And I have to say based on our registration numbers we had for this FLO panel, we have more than 106 registrations. I think it's safe to say that the topic of academic integrity is indeed highly relevant. We will put a short survey link also in the chat for you. You don't have to complete that now. But since some people sometimes have to leave earlier, we want to make sure you grab that link. Just a three-minute survey and we would love to hear from you about your experience this morning, but also very importantly, what are other topics you think we need to address in our professional development here at BCcampus? A few housekeeping items. We are recording this session and the recording will be made publicly available. So if you do not wish to be recorded, please just refrain from coming on screen. And you can also change your name as it is displayed to FLO participant or something generic. We have no breakout sessions today. We will all remain here in the main room. And we do hope that you'll engage through the chat. And please keep your questions coming in the chat. And when invited to, you could unmute later when we have a period for questions as well. I would like to at the beginning of this session, also think like to thank Paula and Kelsey who are tech support team behind the scenes. Thank you for supporting us in this event. And live captioning is enabled for those who want to turn that on. Next slide.

Well, we're zooming in from different regions across Canada today. I would like to start by thanking the Lekwungen speaking people who include the Songhees and Esquimalt nations for their hospitality. So you may be puzzled by the two pictures here. It's not really beautiful, anything like that. It's just pictures of the screen in front of my house over the last 48 hours. It's covered in snow as you can see. It's just a reminder for me because for the past 15 years I've been fortunate to live here on the beautiful Vancouver Island in a place that's now called Langford. But every time it snows, it really reminds me that I'm not from here. I like to see it. I don't like to be in it. I am reminded that I have responsibility not only to build a relationship with the land, but also to build a relationship with the First Peoples here. And therefore, I'm very thankful to the Lekwungen speaking people for their hospitality. As a way for us to connect with the land this morning, I invite you to look out your window or think about where you are right now. And maybe put a word or a phrase that describes your landscape. If you would like to add the territory that you are joining us from, you're welcome to do so as well. And I'll give

1

you a minute to do that. It's lovely to read your words of being grateful and thankful for the land that you're on. So with that, you can continue to do that. But we have a full schedule, so I'll move along. Thank you for sharing. Before I introduce our moderator for today's session, I would like to introduce you to our student representative Jenelle Davies. Jenelle is the organizer for the BC Federation of Students. It's an organization representing over 170,000 students in every region of this province. Jenelle is also very busy still as a fourth year student at Simon Fraser University, completing her bachelor's degree majoring in labour studies. Hello, Jenelle.

JENELLE DAVIES:
Hi everyone. Thanks for having me here today and I'm really excited to be a part of this panel and give the perspective of a student in these spaces. And I have, before I was back in a student role, I actually had the opportunity to work at the Students Union of Vancouver Community College. So shout out to any people from VCC in the chat here. And I got to represent students in a lot of Ombuds cases in terms of grade appeals and that sort of thing. So it's a big conversation around our table with our members and also as a student and so I'm excited to have these conversations today about how we can make our experience better for students like me and for our students across the province. So thank you.

HELENA:
Thank you, Jenelle, we're just so glad you joined us. And Jenelle will be quite active in the chat and she will also provide a synthesis at the end of the panel discussion. So now I want to convey my great and deep gratitude to our moderator for today's discussion and Anita Chaudhuri. Anita is an assistant professor of teaching in the Department of English and Cultural Studies at the University of British Columbia, Okanagan campus. She's their faculty advisor on academic integrity, so she's passionate about this topic. She co-chairs Academic Integrity Advisory Group. She supports the development of an etiquette of approach in this area. So Anita, thank you so much for bringing together this group of panelists for us today. And it gives us great confidence that I hand over the session to you now.

ANITA CHADHURI:
Thank you so much. I really appreciate that introduction. Hello, everyone. Thank you once again for joining us today for this panel on educative approaches to academic integrity. I am an assistant professor of teaching with the Department of English and Cultural Studies and of course wear the other hat of faculty advisor, a temporary hat, at UBC Okanagan campus. I wanted to offer my territorial acknowledgement before getting started. I wanted to respectfully acknowledge the Syilx Okanagan Nation and their people in traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory where UBC Okanagan is situated.

Now, moving on with the next slide to get us started with a shared understanding of educative approaches and academic integrity. I have included for us this quotation from Miron Eaton, McBreairty & Baig. Their 2021 article. And I quote, "Cultures of academic integrity are built and sustained through the cooperation and commitment of all members of the learning

2

community." So here we are. We may see this panel or learning space as an opportunity to ask questions. And that researchers have noted as gaps in the work that's happening in academic integrity. And contribute or think about what work needs to be done, can be done by us, the stakeholders, the very diverse group of people interested in this area. Questions such as, how can academic integrity policies be better enacted? may resonate with you. Or something like how do new students, first-generation learners, international students, new immigrants know the institutional structures and other norms of higher education? How do they know where to turn for assistance or unpack the complexities of university language and culture. Or as Hatton, Stokes and Alpen's 2018 article noted what institutional efforts have been made to support students unfamiliar with institutional structures and systems that can compromise their compliance with academic integrity norms and expectations. So I leave you with a few of these questions here, but I'm sure there'll be more questions coming from you that I'll be happy to be taking and Jenelle will be helping me look at those and monitor the Q&A space. We'll be using the chat as the Q&A space, of course. And take those questions to our panelists and as a group figure out some ways forward. So therefore, the questions that I presented before you to respond to them will go to the panelists in a bit, of course.

I would also like to draw your attention to Bretag et al.'s 2011 article where they proposed five core elements. So the article was titled "Core Elements of Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy in Australia, in Higher Education." And of course here we are in the Canadian context. But still thinking about the five core elements that they presented: access, approach, responsibility, detail, and support. Now all five of these elements are interconnected. And fit concern for teaching and learning goals at academic institutions. The elements are also, can be viewed as central, not only to policy, as the article takes up policy and procedural aspects of academic integrity, but also educational ones, as is the premise of this panel today. So the five: access, approach, responsibility, detail, and support. These elements can facilitate or can be used as a checklist to see a centralized support systems that already exist, the services that are already on offer, that facility teaching and learning. They can prompt discussion on educative approaches in committees or communities of learning that can be set up. Developed strategies to identify academic misconduct, as well as those that enhance understanding of policy language, penalties, effective integrity, plans, so on and so forth. This kind of detailing is not just to inform students, but also to learn from them. Their cultural expectations, understanding, experience, applying or application of students as partners of framework creating space to discuss emerging technologies and their implication, to name a few. Supporting this work is essential and in my anecdotal observation, we do face challenges, challenges of perhaps discipline-based expectations, time and availability, and other aspects of engagement and motivation just to stay motivated and do this work in academic integrity. This panel is one such effort and shares viewpoints on academic integrity, offers take-away strategies to learn and engage with diverse stakeholders.

And in my next slide, you'll notice that I have of course listed our panelists and we begin with Dr. Subtata Bhowmik who'll be talking about culture and academic integrity in second language writing instruction. And from there we move into a student point of view with students as

partners in academic integrity. And Beatriz Antonieta Mova will be leading that presentation, that conversation. And then we turn to the very hot topic of the day, artificial intelligence, particularly ChatGPT. And Dr. Laura McNeil will take us through academic integrity versus artificial intelligence. And how teaching and learning with academic integrity in this age of ChatGPT is possible. We'll finally end with Dr. Anita Lam's presentation on EDI and academic integrity policy language. However, I'd like to mention that Dr. Anita Lam is unable to join us virtually. But here's another thing. She is not joining in in-person virtually, but rather we have a recorded presentation from her. And we will be conducting or sharing it with you, of course, and bring that into conversation in our chat. Take questions up and of course, be willing to share questions to Dr. Lam so she's able to respond back to them as well. She's unfortunately caught up, but we'll get started with the panel for the day and now hand it over to Dr. Bhowmik. Welcome Dr. Bhowmik.

SUBRATA BHOMIK:
Thank you, Anita and Helena for inviting me for this conversation today. I'm really, really delighted to speak about this topic which is very close to my heart, and something that I enjoy working on and reading about, studying. So basically I'll be focusing on culture, looking at culture and academic integrity, but my discussion will be specifically focused on second language writing instructional contexts. So hopefully, this will generate some, some conversations followed by my talk.

I want to begin with a little bit of giving you an overview of the relationship between culture and writing and academic integrity, right? So a cultural understanding of writing is really important in order for us to be aware about the ways our text, we actually produce texts. We being… it is not necessarily in academic contexts, but also outside of academia. There is that cultural thread running throughout, no matter in what context you are writing. So it is really important. Sometimes and most of the time in fact, this phenomenon kinda goes unnoticed. But that cultural understanding or cultural phenomena are there all the time. And we all know that writing is a very, very complex process. It involves not only cognitive, social, ideological, various personal factors that in some way or other end up influencing the way we write, the way we produce, we construct, construct the text that eventually come out. Now when you think about it, when with all these complex factors, when you add culture to the mix, the process, the process of producing text or the process of writing, it becomes really, really complicated to tease apart. Like how did you do... How did you do this? How did you come up with this piece of writing? What exactly happened? What exactly did we go through before we came up with this piece of writing? Now, this is where an understanding of the writing process in the cultural milieus. It kind of helps us make that connection with academic integrity and we can investigate or we can... It helps us understand whether or not or why or not a piece of writing follows the academic integrity of the principles of academic integrity. This is how they all kinda get connected, get linked. When you think about second language writing students. This process is really, really important as educators for us to understand. Because if we don't, then sometimes we generalize things and sometimes we really do not understand what is going on. Sometimes the things can be really, really serious in the sense that there are various stakes

4

involved. Sometimes students can be penalized, sometimes they can be expelled from the university altogether. There are high stakes involved in the process unless we are clear about all these issues. So that is the generalized overview of how they are linked and connected.

I want to speak to you a little bit about culture and writing, or more specifically cultural and writing studies. To my understanding, to my knowledge. Robert Kaplan was the first who came up with this idea in his famous article, 1966 article in language, *Journal of Language Learning*, where he mentioned that writers thought patterns are related to their cultural backgrounds. I know it created a lot of controversies and lots of debates, but that is not an issue. If you think about culture and writing systematic study, that was the first time probably when the connection between culture and writing kind of came into the limelight. In Kaplan's words, he tried to help English language writers and non-native English language writers. And he was trying to figure out how is it that we can support them. So he taught or he believed that the way we think is determined by the background, the cultural background that we come from. Kaplan also believed that cultural backgrounds are really important in the way... important to consider in the way how we organize our ideas. Specifically in writing. Because unless we are considering the way we are thinking, because that is what is reflected in our writing eventually. So it is important for us to understand how our cultural backgrounds impact our organizational patterns in writing. And likewise, we can assume, and Kaplan assumed that writers of different languages and by implication then, different cultural backgrounds. Because culture and language, they are linked and related, would then write differently because thought patterns are determined by the cultural backgrounds, language and culture are related, and therefore writers from different language backgrounds, then write differently. And here is why when someone writes in a language that is not their first language, should be writing in a way that typically diverges from the way the native speakers of that particular language write. And that's why, that was the explanation that Kaplan gave. Why non-native English writers write differently compared to native English speakers. Of course, there are debates about it. I'm not getting into that debate and critical examination of Kaplan, Kaplan's position on that. And therefore, as readers, native language speakers, they would typically view the other side of the coin. The non-native, the texts produced by non-native English speakers or non-native speakers of any language to be divergent. So that was the explanation that Kaplan gave. And these marked the theory of what came to know, came to be known as contrastive rhetoric, the theoretical foundation of Kaplan's work, which obviously evolved over the years. But that kind of laid the foundation of culture and writing studies, which is known as contrastive rhetoric to give you a broad, very broad overview.

Now, it is not just Kaplan, but also post-process writing theories. Some of the big names in this area, Patricia Bizzell, John Trimbur, Lil Brannon, and Mina Shaughnessy. All these people, they put a lot of emphasis on the connection between social and cultural factors and writing activities. So, and by the way, they did not speak to second-language writer specifically, but writing in general. They also believed that our sociocultural background is kind of related to, very much related to writing. Bizell, for example, in her book, she, she argued that individual performance in writing, individual performance, differences in individual performance does not

5

depend on the differences in individual, rather writing performance she believed, and she found that writing performance actually correlates differences in social, cultural backgrounds and typically, poor performance in writing correlates less privileged social groups. So students who are coming from lower socioeconomic class typically perform badly in writing. And therefore, Patricia Bizell, she went on to argue that students usually struggle in their academic writing not because of their cognitive or linguistic deficiencies, but because of their cultural unfamiliarity with the way they are exposed to the academic institutions or from their childhood. And usually more privileged students, they perform better. Other literacy scholars, they also made a similar kind of argument of the same, same argument that there is a clear connection between academic performance, academic writing performance, and sociocultural, socioeconomic background that the students come from there is that the link there. Very interesting study. It is very old. But Mina Shaughnessy, she analyzed lots of writing, writing performances, successive drafts by unskilled students. What she found is that the writing process was essential, what she called a socialization process. In other words, it is a process that brings the writer in line with the discourse community of the reader. So that is how we make that link and make that connection in order for the writer to be successful. Now, just from this discussion, as you can see, all these colours, they provided a lot of, given a lot of emphasis on the way writing is, the writing takes place, the sociocultural or more specifically, I'm interested in cultural background that the writer is part of. It goes without saying that writers' social, cultural backgrounds are very, very important in the way they write, in the way that they produce text.

Now, the problem is, it is so hard to define culture. Like if I asked, what is culture? I'm sure that there will be as many definitions as many participants that we have. And they'll be completely separate and quite, not surprising so. So unfortunately in spite of this recognition, there is no all-encompassing, widely agreeable definition of culture. So that is the reality. That is the way we can recognize the importance of culture and yet we cannot define it, it cannot capture it. But as I said, scholars over the years have recognized the value of culture, more specifically, for example, Atkinson, he recognized the explanatory value of culture, particularly when it comes to second language writing. Now, Atkinson, he has done a lot of work on culture, specifically culture and second-language writing. And in order to, in order to avoid any disagreement or, not disagreement but debate and controversy. Instead of defining culture, he came up with three different approaches to culture. So the first approach to conceptualize culture is what he defined as, described as the received view of culture. Now the received view of culture is more like a commonsensical view of the mass. For example, Canadian culture or Arab culture and so on. A particular nation state or a particular group, particular society and so on. Then the second view of culture is critical post-modernist view of culture. This is kind of identifying cultural in the complexities of life, which is always in flux, which we cannot hold onto. We do not know what it is, but we know there is something called culture. So it just moves on with the complexity and hybridity of life in general. And the third approach that he took is what he describes as middle ground view of culture. Cultural systems only exist in virtual form or abstract form. They take shape only when we, the people, enact on them or act on them. So that is the view that he came up with as the middle ground view of culture.

6

Now, I also want to, it is… because it is so relevant, I want to bring in two other definitions of two other conceptualization of culture. And just to show... because for one they are relevant and two, just to show how complex this idea, the notion of culture is. And one of those is Pennycook's argument about culture. And he made the point that sometimes culture is misinterpreted when it comes to issues such as plagiarism. These concepts are misinterpreted from a cultural point of view, and that is why it becomes complicated. For example, he explained that the notion of plagiarism, the way it is understood in the West, is culturally constructed. And he went on to argue that it can potentially have different meanings in different, different cultures. For example, in China, plagiarism has completely different meanings, completely different connotations. So he just invited us or invites us to be careful about how we define these terms. And a big cultural, underlying assumption, cultural assumption in the way we define terms. Then he also made the point that sometimes these terms are insufficiently defined. For one, it is culturally defined, and for two, it is insufficiently defined and it does not account for the behaviours, the many, many behaviours that are that are there around the world. For example, plagiarism can be insufficiently defined and does not take account of many different motivations for copying texts illegitimately. For example, in certain culture in China, texts there can be legitimate or illegitimate ways of copying this, but it is not viewed in that particular culture as plagiarism, as stealing the way we view it in the West. Another idea is the concept of originality. And he showed that how this concept as we use it in writing. Because a big part of writing, the way to start in the West is you have to maintain originality. But Pennycook claims the idea of originality with the growth and valorization of individualism. Because individualism is a big Western part of Western culture, right? So both are kind of linked.

The second conceptualization of culture I want to talk about is that of Holliday.

ANITA:
I'm sorry, Subrata, I'm going to interrupt just to be mindful of time, maybe take another minute and wrap it up so we're able to.

SUBRATA:
Okay. So in this conceptualization, small and big culture, he did not go into the debate or the dichotomization... dichotomies between culture, this or that culture. But he came up with this idea of small and big culture, and when time to show culture as a process rather than culture as a product. And how the big cultures are essentially they are in the confluence of various small cultures. So since I'm out of time, so hopefully I had a few more slides to talk about. Specifically, I was not aware of time, how long I could speak. But yeah, if it comes in the discussion, I'll be happy to share hopefully the rest. of the talk. So I will stop there, I guess. Thank you.

ANITA:

Thank you. Thank you. Subrata. So were there particular practical approaches that you could suggest that culture could be... Or the whole unfamiliarity with culture can be understood? Or approached by instructors or academic integrity demonstrators in some way.

SUBRATA:
Yes. So I came up with this, followed by this very quickly. I came up with a specific cultural framework to be that teachers can use in the context of teaching, specifically second-language writing. And I talked about four different instructional strategies. Number one, being familiar with the ethnic culture of the class, the representativeness of various ethnic cultures. And I discussed how an instructor can do so. The second one is what Flowerdue and Miller called local culture. And local culture is the practices that actually takes place. For example, it could be an example of how students write in that situational context. What they know, what they have, what type of writing that they have done. The most common writing practices they are familiar with. And the most common writing practices they are likely to engage in in their immediate future. The fourth one is called academic culture, which is the values, roles, assumptions. So teachers can be familiar with the students or values, roles, assumptions, patterns, and behaviours of academic culture that they bring to the classroom. And for example, the aspects of writing that in the context of academic writing that they think are valid or not valid, for example, revising, citations, acknowledging sources. Sometimes these are valued, sometimes part of academic culture. Again, sometimes students may come from a context or background that these ideas are not valued at all, and vice versa. Finally, the last strategy is students, making students familiar with the disciplinary culture. And I talked specifically about certain activities, for example, teachers collaborating with colleagues from other disciplines, having students survey different disciplinary writing and being familiar with the academic culture, sorry, disciplinary culture in this specific context. Very briefly, I hope that makes sense.

ANITA:
Yeah, That is fantastic. I think that is really helpful and I think something we can note in the chat also being acknowledged in terms of if you're able to share a slide set. Of course, Helena will pass it along to our attendees and make sure that if there are questions they come up. As we move on to the next presenter now. But of course, we come back and we'll take more questions. So Beatriz, I'm going to hand it over to you because here we are talking about culture and then of course, there's the whole aspect of the student perspective and how we should be thinking about bringing them into the conversation. So I'm going to hand it over to you.

BEATRIZ ANTONIE MOYA:
Well, thank you so much for this opportunity. I will take a second to pull up my slides. Can you see them okay? Perfect. So well, thank you. Thank you so much for this opportunity. I'm honoured to be here as a student and welcome to this presentation called Students as Partners in Academic Integrity. The purpose here is to share some recommendations to create the conditions for learning environments that promote academic integrity, students as partners. And before I start, I would like to share that as a mestiza woman of mixed race, having

Indigenous Mapuche as Spanish roots, I acknowledge the benefits that I experienced because of settler colonialism in Canada and Chile, my home country. As a mestiza woman, I am committed to uplifting and Indigenous voices, supporting Indigenous rights, honouring the treaties, and actively disrupting and challenging any form of oppression against Indigenous people and other groups of people.

Well, you can see I will continue this presentation with my positioning as a PhD student. I will also share my comments around three critical questions. First, why should we care about academic integrity and post-secondary education today? How can we best approach the challenge it is to academic integrity? And finally, how could faculty and educational institutions better support students to become partners? I will close this presentation with comments from theory and my own personal experience.

Well, as a qualitative PhD student, I have learned that positioning is a key element. I am currently a PhD candidate at the Werklund School of Education at the University of Calgary. My main research interests are placing the intersections of academic integrity, scholarship of teaching and learning, and leadership. From here, I am currently developing some roles as a research assistant. For instance, in a project led by Dr. Eden, who's also my supervisor, called Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity: The Ethics of Teaching and Learning with algorithmic writing technologies. I am also a member of various academic integrity committees, networks, and communities of practice. And I also have some student representative roles. If you like some ideas from this presentation, please feel free to share the slides on social media. You can tag me on Twitter or Mastodon.

Let's talk about the first question. Why should we care about academic integrity in post-secondary education today? And to start, well, we need to understand what academic integrity is. You have your own definitions, but I will give a brief overview here just to say that academic integrity is a multi-dimensional concept. It encompasses a variety of definitions. One of the most frequent ones is the one offered by the International Center for Academic Integrity, which defines it as an expectation and commitment to courage, fairness, honesty, responsibility, respect, and trust. Academic integrity can also be seen as a scholarship. For instance, whenever we give attribution to others for their ideas. Likewise, it is a field of research. For this presentation, we will focus on institutional integrity, which relates to aligning what educational institutions promise, the means to attain these promises, and what the institution does.

Well, going back to institutional integrity of keeping it today, it's not an easy task. There are many, many threats to name, just a few. We find transactional approaches to learning with some students potentially seeing themselves as buyers rather than learners. Connected to these, we find a perspective of education as a commodity, potentially also disregarding human development as the main purpose of education. So the threats are not only perspectives, but also very concrete actions taken by some groups. For instance, such as contract cheating, file-sharing companies promoting their services online and hurting the integrity of students' work. On the contract cheating and file-sharing students disengage from teaching and learning

9

activities because tasks are being outsourced to third parties or copied from others. The lack of awareness also of equity, diversity, inclusion, and decolonization perspectives in academic integrity can also be a trap because it might create blind spots that end up in other presentation of some groups in academic misconduct cases. The problems are not only connected to students, we also have seen in the media cases around researchers' misconduct. As we contemplate the media connection, we should not forget about everything happening right now in relation to the emergence of artificial intelligence. You will see a presentation soon that generate texts and various insights into plagiarism that this innovation has started.

Please have a look at some recent news articles. I am showing them just to highlight that we should care a lot about integrity in post- secondary education because today, institutions face greater threats and failure to address these problems properly puts them in risk.

So let's address now our second question. How can we best approach the challenges to academic integrity? And my quick answer is: with students. So anytime we talk about approaches to academic integrity, we need to address two main ones are the punitive and systems approach. The punitive approach identifies breaches of academic integrity as a student misconduct problem. This conceptualization is characteristics of dominant attitudes and responses to academic misconduct until the end of the 20th century. Institutions following this conceptualization, design, and implement the strategy is centred on rule compliance and detection. And the primary question here is, how do we stop students from cheating? The system approach is based on an institutional commitment to ethical conduct at different levels. And this perspective invites institutions to support and offer best conditions for developing a student's academic integrity. It involves adequate pedagogical methods, curriculum assessment to provide students with a foundation that informs their decisions, actions, and knowledge creation. Relevant stakeholders only focus on misconduct and sanctions in the face of breaches. And policy development is an important component of this approach. So building on the work of academic integrity, scholars,

I can explain why the system approach provides a framework to engage students. It guides institutions to see students as one stakeholder, not the only one, to hold academic integrity. Also express promoting the system approach, have actively recommended institutions providing adequate support to students so they can develop their academic integrity skills. Additionally, the system approach provides direction to deal with academic misconduct. The system approach focuses on providing conditions to support academic integrity. We know this, however, we need to complement this with other frameworks to explore better ways to involve students. One feasible way to do this is by integrating the students as partners, constantly developed by the scholarship of teaching or learning or experts. These experts suggest that students can be faculty collaborators in teaching and learning initiatives. Experiences involving students in this way have also made visible students feeling of shared responsibility and empowerment. For the more faculty engage in these sorts of projects, have realized that involving students in this initiative is ethical because students are an integral part of the teaching and learning experiences. For this reason, their participation makes the process more

authentic. Complementing the system approach with the students as partners perspective is critical because it sheds light on how faculty- student relationships could be improved in ways that could properly sustain the development of academic integrity controls.

Another interesting element, that is students partners notion provides, is the idea that there is a continuum of student engagement. You can see on the slide right now, we can use this framework to understand students' participation in teaching and learning innovations. This continuum on the slide belongs to Student Voice Australia, and it shows a progression starting from the lowest level of engagement on your left to the highest level of engagement on your right. In the first level, students just receive information, they become aware of what is happening. It is called inform. The second level comprises students' participation through feedback at a particular point of time. And we can identify it as the consult level. In the middle of the continuum, we find opportunities for ongoing interactions and these could be understood as the Involve level. The fourth level, partner, includes collaboration with students having the same responsibilities as faculty. The last level happens when students lead the way and for this reason it is called control.

Now, on this slide, I would like to show how I have personally been involved as a student partner in academic integrity. So you can see the continuum on top. I could share that instead of academic, the Academic Integrity Hour in Canada community of practice and the Alberta Council of Academic Integrity. I have shared my insights and helped with record keeping. These actions are they Involve level of the student continuum. In my role as a PhD student researcher, I have worked to contribute to building theoretical and empirical bridges between academic integrity and SoTL. And here I have been working at Partner level. I am also a research assistant and academic integrity research project, and this is also at the Partner level. Finally, I have found my voice as a PhD student interacting with a worldwide community in academic integrity. And here my role is at the Control level.

I would also like to share some experiences of students as partners in the province of Alberta and beyond. The first one is from Bow Valley College where researchers studied student experiences with commercial contract cheating and other outsourced behaviours with the support of students during the data analysis process. The second one is from the University of Calgary, where student representatives designed and implemented activities for Academic Integrity Week in 2021. They were grad students who created activities for other graduate students.

We have more examples. For instance, if we look at the international landscape, we have the example of Ireland. And they are built from an interest in making a shared commitment. And they also had the need to create a shared understanding of issues around academic integrity. So they created a student- staff partnership and made note university and developed various initiatives to promote integrity. For instance, social media campaigns, an online student community, and website. The second experience included graduate students in Australia. The students analyzed content on the web related to buying, selling, and trading at file-sharing

websites. To do these, students who were led by a supervisor, use data, a data analysis framework to identify a description of each website and user experience map and a description of the characteristics of the website.

So now we're getting closer to the end of this presentation. I will share some ideas for faculty and educational institutions. But before I go there, just one more idea. I would like to highlight that these recommendations, the ones that I will be sharing soon, are real from my personal experience as a partner, this system approach is the work of several scholars. But I would also like to highlight here the work of Kenny and Eaton, with their integrated model for academic integrity through a SoTL lens. You can see, you can find that chapter in this book. Because it helps provide a critical lens to understand how to promote best conditions. As you can see, the model presents the core elements that influence academic integrity. These are at the centre and they involve high impact professional learning for individuals and groups, local level leaderships and microcultures, scholarship, research and inquiry, learning spaces, pedagogy and technology. All these components become visible in formal and informal spaces at various levels of an organization. And understanding this model is key in producing the suggestions that I will offer.

So some practical recommendations to involve students as partners in academic integrity work. If we want to focus on high impact professional learning for individuals and groups, consider partnering with students to create educational opportunities for them. Their insight and experience will be extremely valuable in creating better examples, problems, explanations, cases, and scenarios. For the same reason, you could consult students with creating academic integrity educational development opportunities or resources intended for faculty, staff and administrators. Suppose our goal is to engage students through local level leadership and micro cultures. Well in that case, you can find ways to involve students in academic integrity committees, working groups, communities of practice. This will provide opportunities to add student voice in emerging conversations and provide a more nuanced perspective. If you're interested in scholarship, research, and inquiry, consider partnering with students in academic integrity research. Students working as research assistants could be your co-authors. You could also consult with students when developing academic integrity in place to improve teaching and learning innovations. Finally, if you focus on learning spaces, pedagogy, and technologies, you could partner with students to understand their insights into how they could be ethically used. As you can see, there are many ways to involve students as partners in academic integrity. I will leave you with two questions: Which foundations would you consider for your context? Which new ideas would you add to this framework? We can continue our conversation with one question here, but also in social media. Thank you so much for your attention today.

ANITA:
Zoom is prompting me to unmute so I must unmute. Thank you so much Beatriz. I think a great set of ideas there. So we'll take up a question now. And I will look to the chat here for if I've missed out on something. And of course, there's always requests for the PowerPoint slides to

be shared, which typically isn't, I think was the response from Helena, but she can talk to it later. We'll come back to Beatriz, of course. And so Theodore Abbots's question here is, As a student and peer tutor, this is all very germane. However, if this recording will be available, well, that's not much of a question Beatriz, is it? But I suppose the one thing you could direct us to would be what have been some of the takeaways? Like has there been a study you've come across where graduate students or undergraduates who have participated in a controlled sort of a project or a partnered project. And what were their typical takeaways?

BEATRIZ:
Well, this is a very interesting question because one of the experiences that I showcased in the province of Alberta was one that I was involved. So I would like to also give a shoutout to Alex Paquette and Sarah Eaton, who were also part of this presentation that we prepare for the European Conference on Academic Integrity last year. And some of the main takeaways here are that there is untapped potential in students and partly there are different ways in which academic integrity work is developed. So usually, not only by looking into the literature, but also in our own experiences, you can realize that student voice is a desire, is something that everyone wants. But how to find the best ways to integrate it has been elusive in some ways. So one side of the analysis was connected to this idea of finding better conceptual tools to frame and guide this work with the students. But also, it had a lot to do with this idea that we ask the students could... There's a high rotation of students' roles. So one thing that we ask the students could do in that sense would be to create resources that we could pass to newer generations of students. So that they could start from the knowledge that we have more life as students in terms of academic integrity work. So these were, there were some other ideas we covered in this presentation, but some of the key takeaways are that we still have to weave the theoretical and empirical connections to involve students in better ways. And the second side, it's on our, our responsibility, which is to find better ways to pass this knowledge to our peers. So those are some key takeaways I could share at the moment.

ANITA:
Thank you so much. And of course we'll come back to you, but we must move on with Dr. Laurie McNeil's presentation. Laurie, over to you.

LAURIE MCNEILL:
Good stuff. Thank you so much to Anita and BCcampus for the invitation and to my fellow panelists for these rich conversations. I'm presenting today in Vancouver on the traditional, ancestral, occupied, unceded territories and the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh nations. And in making this acknowledgment in the context of this panel, I do so with reflection on how teaching and learning with integrity must always engage these colonial histories of education. The recognition of harms done through these practices, and the commitment to learning, rethinking and active disruption of those legacies.

I began with an image that may be familiar to you if you grew up with Mad Magazine and the Spy vs. Spy comic that ran in its pages. It's what immediately came to mind when I thought of

my title, AI versus AI, which I have subsequently discovered other people thought was a good title for their papers to consider it an homage. The comic works well metaphorically too and capturing the dominant tenor of public and academic response to ChatGPT, that these are two opposing factions are mortal enemies battling it out. That academic integrity and possibly all of civilization is under threat. I think this is understandable if we think of it as a fight or flight response to what is clearly a transformative change. It's also a framework that in so many ways runs counter to the principles of an educative approach to academic integrity and one that doesn't therefore serve educators' or students' needs. In my time today, if I can make my slides turn. Here we go. I'm in my time today. I'll consider what we need to remember as the key principles for an educative approach to ChatGPT. How we can make informed decisions about how we could adapt our teaching and learning to this new development and how we can build from these principles and strategies for conversations with students and with colleagues about how we respond with integrity to this new technology. I thought I would begin just very briefly by offering a short primer to ChatGPT, appreciating that some of us are experts in understanding these new technologies and others of us, they are new to us or we're still grappling with them. It's helpful for me to understand just actually how ChatGPT works. It is a generative or predictive text, chat, a chat bot or an app. One of the things I thought was useful for me to understand and might be for you as well, is that it is scraping Internet content, not to copy that content, but to look for patterns in it. And that was something that Mills and Dimopoulos articulated really clearly. It's been compared to a calculator in terms of thinking about this as a seismic shift in learning, but as Haggart argues, it's not like a calculator in that it thinks or it's producing content in ways that calculators do not. And we might think of it as more akin to our existing supportive software apps like grammar, spellcheck, or my big quote, favourite Grammarly. It's not... When I speak about ChatGPT, I'm really referring to ChatGPT, etc. because there are many other existing AI bots and many more on the way. It is very clearly here to stay.

I wanted to outline five principles that I see as foundational to an educative approach. Does teaching and learning with or in a time of generative language models like ChatGPT. These are really the same principles that underpin a general educated approach to academic integrity. And I hope that we'll find that reassuring because it suggests we already have effective frameworks and strategies that will help us go forward. The first one is always about education, both for our students but also for ourselves. Making sure that we have the information we need to understand what this ChatGPT means and how we could or whether we not, we should use it in our courses. For some of us, that means getting a handle on a technology that might be unfamiliar to us. For some of our students, that might mean thinking in different ways about technology is not neutral. And thinking about these conversations, they're very much like the ones we advocate having with your students about contract cheating. We don't have to have all the answers to necessarily understand how all of it works. But the importance is, the important thing is to have that discussion and often to learn from our students, to have students as partners as Beatriz has argued. Fortunately, there's many resources being generated to help instructors get up to speed on what the technology means and how to address it. I refer to some of these throughout my talk and I have the works cited at the end. In general, I would cite

the consistently excellent and continuously updated work from University of Calgary's Werklund School of Education, as we've seen from Subrata and Beatriz, as led by the fabulous Sarah Eaton. And collaborative and crowdsourced OER resources compiled by Anna Mills as just two starting points. The most recent episode of John Oliver's Last Week Tonight is also an excellent primer, and in fact, we have some overlap. I was a little chagrined on Sunday night when I thought I'd been scooped by John Oliver. The remaining principles about expectations or rationale engagement and a harm reduction model reminds us that as always, whatever choices we make about whether or not we see the use of ChatGPT as aligned with the learning goals of our courses, we need to communicate that expectation to our students and engage them in a conversation about how those align with or not. And why. Ideally our decisions about how to respond, whether that's opting in or opting out, and changes we might make to our assessment practices as a result, will be informed by and model the ethical elements that are core to an ethos of integrity. So here I'm thinking that of the need to be mindful about accessibility, about implicit bias, and also about the technology itself. We've done a lot of learning over the last few years about how in policing for misconduct, we've done a lot of harm, creating conditions that have unequally cast suspicions on or imposed barriers for some groups of students. And what we could do instead. So let's make sure that as we respond to this latest change, this transformative moment, that we aren't undoing the efforts that we've made to create cultures of integrity, to take educative approaches and address systemic ableism, racism, and other biases as we proceed.

For ourselves and our students, we need to begin by thinking together about what ChatGPT use might look like, under what circumstances and what it means to use it. So thinking in the spirit of partnership and generative dialogue, we can ask students to help us redesign what we're doing with AI in mind. This involves students as partners, investing in their own learning, and its evaluation. Such an invitation directly intervenes in the adversarial or policing dynamic that AI versus AI might reintroduce so that we don't return to default distrust models that assume students plan to cheat. It's important to consider how we think about... It's important for us to consider together how artificial intelligence works and this one in particular. What are the costs of using it or not using it? How does ChatGPT and its ilk learn from who is it learning from, whose ideas and perspectives and values are "baked in." As Mills and Dimpopoulos put it, this can and should lead to important discussions about how technology is not neutral. This is an update on conversations that we should have been having, and many of us did have, about social media platforms and algorithms. How artificial intelligence is designed by people and learns from content produced by people. That means it will reproduce the biases already in circulation to make a joke just about as old as my Mad Magazine cartoon. I used to teach my students about Facebook's algorithms by explaining that, no, they're made by people and therefore carry people's, people's values by referring to *Soylent Green*. It is made of people. This will be true too of any kind of algorithmic detection software that's currently under development. And therefore, we need to be careful, cautious, mindful as we take up these new technologies. We also have to think about the exposés emerging about the terrible labour conditions for employees who are working to produce these companies. And the content that's being scraped without attribution. We can think together with our students about the

15

limitations of ChatGPT. For instructors, we might be thinking about those limitations in terms of how we design assignments that won't reward the use of AI, as well as those who do see its use as okay. So for example, ChatGPT can produce good-looking, generic, and totally unsubstantiated prose. But it can't problem-solve. It can explain its logic. It can't close read passages, and it can't accurately cite sources. Exploring those gaps with students is an opportunity to have students reflect on what AI misses and why that matters. It's also a reminder to students that they need to understand what it can't do and that they are accountable for the work that they are producing with if they're using AI. So that means they need to be fact-checking, content checking, citing or listing the bot as a co-author as just some examples of ethically using these sources.

One conversation starter I'd encourage us to have is to think about the how and when and why the use of such a bot might be okay. You may have seen some public outcry to Vanderbilt University's use of ChatGPT to write an email and response to the recent shooting at Michigan State. People were appalled to find out that their news release was written by ChatGPT. So the question to take up with students ensuring an example like this is to think about why that usage was not seen as okay, because it can flag for us that we do have limits to where we see it as appropriate, which reminds us. And this goes back to Subrata's presentation that writing is a socially situated practice that has to align with the rhetorical situation and the communities it's addressing. In this case, Vanderbilt University seemed to have missed the mark in substituting ChatGPT, even though the content may have seemed totally... Content and tone may have seemed totally appropriate to the situation. Also highly encourage us to be talking with our colleagues. Sharing the load of this work is so important in part because then we don't have to have all the answers ourselves. We don't have to figure out all of the changes we need to make individually. In my own department, I worked with a group of faculty to provide discipline relevant responses and introduction to ChatGPT and to share strategies that address our own critical practices and are often writing based assessments. And that's been a really generative conversation. As we have thought about... We have five different people who teach different kinds of courses. What would it look like in our, the kinds of things we ask our students to do? But also in the context of our discipline? The question of originality which Subrata also brought up, is going to be a huge matter for us to deal with and whatever discipline we are in. What does it mean to do your own work? To be an author in the context of ChatGPT? To what extent can we say this is what we're asking students to do. I know that the journal *Science* is not allowing submissions that credit ChatGPT as a co-author, which may not mean that people don't use it. It just means they're not attributing authorship to the bot. That I think is one of those big thorny questions that we will have to reflect on and that will change conversations in our disciplines. I think we also need to continue to extend and have new discussions about collaboration, and collaboration is always a challenging situation for academic integrity purposes anyway. One that our students find difficult and that we ourselves do. This adds a wrinkle. So it's an opportunity to have those conversations again. I think while we're having those conversations, it's time for reflection on assessment to look at some of the things that we might just be doing traditionally in our courses, in our disciplines. And having the time to rethink that maybe, maybe some of these practices don't work for us anymore because they

don't really align with their pedagogical goals or how our disciplines work now. In my English department subcommittee, we've been having conversations about really formalizing for ourselves and for our colleagues about how we are no longer, if we ever were, the grammar police. We can just formerly park that badge. Because most of us are really interested in foregrounding content in terms of our assessment. And this is an opportunity to talk it through. And it's been very helpful as we've had those conversations about assessment, to also be thinking about how do we create a culture of integrity more broadly. And so I think it's a lemonade moment really as we have these discussions. And finally the conversation I'd like us all to be having with ourselves and with our colleagues, is that piece about the harm reduction model. What do we need to be thinking as we rethink, rather than simply radically changing all of the ways we assess or going back to practices. For example, in my own discipline of making all writing be done in person and by hand, are there potential harms that those things might cause? Are some of the assumptions we're making problematic and not evidence-based? We cannot count on technology to save us as Whitney Gegg-Harrison writes. The detection platforms that are under development are going to be once again highly biased and also fallible and could re-introduce many of the same biases about academic misconduct, who commits it, how, and why. So, just in closing, I wanted to say that I've shared principles that are... principles and practices that are deliberately capacious or flexible. They are allowing us to continue to adapt to these and other new developments in educative rays rather than combative ones. The landscape is changing very quickly. I will note that this slide image was picked by PowerPoint's designer. So it's an example of what I see as a productive collaboration with AI in this case rather than AI versus AI. Thank you very much.

ANITA:
Thank you, Laurie. Absolutely fascinating conversation on artificial intelligence. Just a quick question. This kinda connects to where Beatrice left off and where we're going next with the policy. Do you see this whole AI versus AI moment as an opportunity to really converse with the students of how they're using technology and how learning should be therefore changing? Or assessment practices evolving and then connecting it also to the policy aspect of what does it mean for the policies, the practices in place? It's a bigger question, maybe a shorter answer, so we move and complete and come back to it. But then please, over to you.

LAURIE:
I realize I should have given a shoutout and maybe we can drop in in the link that Anita and I wrote an op-ed for UBC's inaugural *Academic Integrity* newsletter, although it's also available on UBC's Academic Integrity website. Okay, so shameless promotion plug done. You did ask me something, and that was about should I have, should we have conversations with their students and how will this inform policy? I think Beatriz has made such a convincing case. But also those are my own experiences, I don't actually know. I don't have all the answers and it's incredibly paralyzing to think that I'm supposed to be expert on these things. And I don't have to be. Let's have a conversation with students who can then reflect on why it should matter to them. How does it interfere with their own learning? How was it opposed their own learning? Or how might it be useful? But as the Vanderbilt example shows us, they need to be mindful as they go

outside of our individual courses into various situations to think with an informed and critical eye about when it's appropriate or not and how. So they're not simply defaulting to that without it being part of a larger critical practice in terms of policy. As you and I know from our work at UBC, so much of policy is written at a really capacious, high-level language that this would probably fall under existing discussions of appropriate uses of technology. But as Sarah Eaton and others have argued, this is going to really radically change the meaning of plagiarism. So very fortunately, that's not one of the things I have to be responsible for in terms of figuring out this nut. But it has to be a conversation that really has to be students, staff, faculty, and administration in dialogue and informed by a commitment that we are not going back to practices that took the adversarial or a punitive approach. Thank you for the question.

ANITA:
And there are a few more questions, of course, coming in the chat, and we'll come back to these ones after Helena has helped us. with the next presentation. Helena and Paula, you're helping us play that. Thank you so much.

HELENA:
Yes, I believe Paula is ready for that recording. Continue throughout to just add in the chat.

[RECORDING OF ANITA LAM]:
I am delighted to be here today, especially to start a longer conversation about equity, diversity, and inclusion in academic integrity policies and processes. What follows is a presentation based on a personal mix of insights, training, and experiences. By training, I'm a criminologist. Since 2020, however, I've been serving as an associate dean in a very large, very diverse liberal arts faculty in Canada. In this role, I present nearly every week academic dishonesty cases to a faculty-level committee. This committee has been set up to consider student appeal cases and also to sanction students according to the logic of progressive discipline. Over the past three years, I've been increasingly troubled by the emotional, social, and academic consequences of applying sanctions to students who are clearly distressed in multiple ways. Many of these students appear to be from equity-seeking groups. Because Canadian universities are seeking to enhance equity, diversity, and inclusion, or EDI, I would like to take the time today to trouble seemingly easy or uncritical insertions of EDI language into academic integrity policies. As some universities are in the process of revising their academic integrity policies, these policies may come to include language about explicit commitments to principles of fairness, equity, diversity and inclusion, social justice, anti-racism, and accessibility. These principles are commendable, but they're also very abstract. So how are these principles operationalized in practice? Academic integrity policies are not just documents that explicitly recognize the values upheld by a university. They also contain important information about procedures and processes. For me then, attention arises when the language of EDI is translated into academic misconduct processes that have been traditionally oriented towards disciplining, punishing, and excluding students. It might be possible to make academically honest students feel a greater sense of belonging at the university by sanctioning those who engage in academic misconduct. But on the whole, I remain quite perplexed by the idea that we can enhance

This transcript of FLO Panel: Educative Approaches to Academic Integrity (March 1, 2023) by BCcampus is licensed under a CC BY 4.0 License. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

inclusion and processes designed to single out particular students for punishment and exclusion. Depending on the university, I'll take mine as an example here. Breaches of academic integrity can be explicitly or implicitly conceived as offenses. When we conceive of academic misconduct in this way, we are borrowing the language and processes of the criminal justice system. Whether in the criminal justice system or the system of handling academic misconduct, there is first an investigation. Someone on the front lines detects wrongdoing. Witnesses are then interviewed, evidence is gathered, and someone might eventually be accused. Some universities here might also lately use the language of guilt so that the accused may plead guilty or be found guilty of an academic offense. As in an adversarial system, the accused has a right to raise a full defense by telling their side of the story at a hearing. The accused is then judged. If found guilty, sanctions are applied according to guidelines that take into consideration aggravating factors such as the severity of the offense or mitigating factors, such as extenuating personal circumstances or procedural irregularities. I am beginning my presentation here with the starting premise that many of our current academic misconduct practices have been imagined and realized in relation to criminal justice practices. The standards of proof are quite different. But the language of the accused and offender underlie how we might be implicitly treating students caught in the web of our academic integrity processes. I say all of this as a preface to explain how the simple application of EDI language and academic integrity policies will just be inadequate for reorienting practices. And processes away from student discipline, punishment, and exclusion. Using EDI language may also have the effect of glossing over other issues, such as how we actually meaningfully and thoughtfully operationalize EDI in the context of academic integrity investigations and misconduct hearings. As others have argued, far more cogently than I, EDI itself is an acronym that pushes together three distinct ideas. While equity, diversity, and inclusion can intersect, interact, and interconnect and multifaceted ways. These terms are also separate. Although definitions of these terms are still in flux and will continue to evolve with time.

Inclusion often refers to ensuring that people feel a sense of belonging. It has also been defined as "the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity." Diversity, by contrast, refers to the presence of difference and variety of personal experiences, values, and worldview that arise from difference of culture and circumstance. And lastly, equity can refer to the guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for students, faculty, instructors, and staff at every stage of educational and career development. Despite these distinct definitions, however, equity, diversity, and inclusion can be conflated with each other, especially when they are packaged together under the acronym EDI.

These conflations are amplified when policies fail to specify if EDI considerations should, first and foremost, shape academic integrity procedures or if they should inform decisions made by faculty members and committees about the outcomes of students from equity-seeking groups. As I've just argued, EDI is actually three separate principles. Which of these principles we prioritize will also impact how we operationalize academic integrity procedures. This in turn, can have effects on decision-making and academic misconduct cases.

For example, if we take equity as the primary principle to uphold, then we could prioritize fair treatment of all students caught in academic integrity processes. As such, we should be concerned when academic misconduct decisions lead to diverse student outcomes. Diversity, in this sense, can be a sign that decisions have been inconsistently made so that students engaging in similar forms of misconduct under similar circumstances are not facing similar consequences, students would consider kinds of inconsistencies to be unfair and inequitable regardless of whether they come from equity-seeking groups. If fair treatment is central to how we operationalize equity in academic integrity procedures, then we also need to ensure due process. We need to provide all students with an equal opportunity to respond to allegations of academic misconduct and to raise a full defense. By recognizing that many of our students are multilingual, raising a defense for some students will require translation support. And this translation support, if we prioritize equity, may be something a university is obligated to provide. Other equity related efforts in the context of academic integrity processes could focus on ensuring that all students can understand a university's academic integrity policy. Although academic integrity policies are written with good intentions, many of them are often written by faculty members or administrative staff without student feedback. As a result, the policies tend to read like legally binding documents that are indecipherable to most students. If we prioritize diversity instead of equity, then we may need to confront some important questions about how diversity is actually operationalized in the context of academic integrity. Although diverse ways of knowing can be embraced in a course, and instructors can test their students with representing their knowledge in multiple creative formats, the academic standards of a university cannot really be described as diverse. Having presented to various academic misconduct committees in my role as associate dean— and these are committees that are made up of faculty members and student representatives from diverse backgrounds, experienced, and discipline— I can only say that committee members on average tend to share a similar understanding of what counts as academic rigor in a university setting. Diversifying the participants who sit on academic misconduct committees will not substantially change these academic standards or expectations. After all, most committee members are working under the impression that they are safe guarding the academic integrity of courses, programs, and finally, the institution itself. As a result, academic integrity is fundamentally tied to quality assurance, accreditation standards, and an institution's reputation.

When we examined the Latin roots of the word integrity, it's instructive to note there are associations to ideas of wholeness and purity. When students are sanctioned for having violated a university's policy on academic integrity, who or what is being made whole in that process? At first glance, it really doesn't appear as though punitive sanctions will make the student whole. Rather, the sanction can sometimes place the student in further academic jeopardy or introduce new financial stressors to their life, especially if they must retake the failed course. If it's not the student who's being made whole, what then is actually being made whole? I would argue here that the resulting sanctions are meant to make the institution whole again. by applying the sanction, the university's academic reputation can be returned to its original pristine state. And that is not an insignificant feat. A university's academic reputation is

what makes its degrees valuable to both prospective and current students, as well as alumni, employers, and various other stakeholders.

This is why many universities have responded so swiftly and harshly in cases of contract cheating. In its loosest definition, contract cheating refers to the outsourcing of assessed student work to third parties for completion. For example, a student may pay a third party to complete their online exam or to ghost write an essay. Recently, the Globe and Mail reported on a contract cheating in Canada by telling the story of an international student who hired exam takers to complete his exams. The student was quote "found guilty of two counts," end quote of academic misconduct. Note again, here we're seeing the language typically used to describe criminal convictions being used here to describe student outcomes. The student in this case was suspended from the university for five years. And here again, we can note that the sanction is one that will enable both the physical and academic exclusion of the student from the university.

The way the Globe and Mail narrates the story on contract cheating has actually been a familiar one. Research on contract cheating also identifies international students and students for whom English is an additional language as significantly overrepresented in academic misconduct cases. According to the Australian government's Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, international students, particularly from non-English-speaking countries, tend to, as a group, demonstrate less understanding of the meanings and practices of academic integrity. They are twice as likely to have been involved in an academic integrity breach investigation, and they are significantly more likely to report engaging in contract cheating. Interestingly enough, the 2022 Canadian Student Well-Being Survey indicates that international students are also significantly more likely to report witnessing cheating when compared to domestic students during the COVID pandemic.

Given the drive to recruit more international students across various Canadian universities, it's disconcerting that narratives about contract cheating and academic misconduct seem to focus so heavily on students that help make our campuses diverse. Many of our international students are racialized. Many of them may not speak English as their first language. When these factors intersect in conversations about academic misconduct, we run the very real risk of othering international students. When criminological theories are applied to understand contract cheating, we're also implicitly treating students as though they were criminals or potential repeat offenders. As criminology is still reckoning with the racist implications and effects of its own theorizing, it really should not be a model for how we approach academic integrity. Especially if we wanted to take a thoughtful approach to integrating EDI considerations into both policy and practice. While championing diversity and inclusion and striving towards equity sound immensely laudable, critical questions should still be asked about how EDI considerations will shape academic integrity, policies, and processes, as well as student outcomes. While academic integrity policies can signal the values of an institution, it's equally important that we explore how these values will actually inform the way we rethink,

reconsider, and re-envision existing structures, practices, and standards. Thank you for your time.

ANITA:

Okay. So that was Dr. Lam's presentation. Super interesting. And I have noticed some comments that have come up and it'd be great if you're able to go back to them and the few questions as well. But first, I'd like to pass it over to Jenelle. And she will of course, be bringing this panel together with observations and commentaries and then help shift into the Q&A as well. Thank you, Jenelle.

JENELLE: [BJ2]

Thanks. I feel like this was a great collection of folks, both in presenters and folks in the chat and people participating to really talk about academic integrity and how we can make our campuses more productive and better places. Not just for students, but also for the faculty experience. Because I like to acknowledge that your working conditions are our learning conditions and so much of what we do and needs to be done in tandem together. And so it's heartening to hear a lot of the conversations about including students in these sorts of conversations that have traditionally left students out as being the receivers of knowledge and not being able to participate with doing this higher level view of our institutions. So I'm happy everybody's taken the time to be here today.

I come from this work as a non-traditional academic student. I went back to school. I went to Douglas College as a mature student, which at 25, I didn't feel like a mature student until people in my first class were talking about prom and graduation they had just attended and I was like, I am certainly a mature student. Thank you very much. I'm a student who grew up in a poor family. My family is working class. They come from, they have nice unionized jobs, but we grew up in poverty. And I'm the first person in my family to graduate high school, much less go to a college and now a university. It has not happened in my family before. And when I told my mother I was going to go to Douglas College, she actually begged me not to go to school because she was worried about what taking on student debt would mean for me because she had seen how debt had impacted her life and so academia when I attended college was never a place I thought I would see myself in and I'd never really saw how I fit into the college and university campus experience. And thankfully, I had my student union who I got involved with and then got to do this work as my community. But it is certainly a challenge when you come from a marginalized background to fit into academia as it exists. And I think part of my goal in doing this work moving forward is really challenging all of us to challenge what academia is, and what it ought to be. Because we are the people who can actively challenge and create an experience of what we think it ought to be, not what it is now.

I think that a lot of the conversations today we've been hearing about ChatGPI and academic integrity and how those things intersect is really thinking about students as individuals from diverse backgrounds and what that actually brings to our campus community and to our knowledge as a whole and how we can harness that. And really challenge what are we doing

22

and why are we doing it? And I think we brought up a lot of those great conversations today in terms of really starting to challenge those concepts. Like why do we assign a certain type of writing assignment, for instance, in class, like what are we intending to get out of it? Are we intending to have somebody be able to express that they read the readings and they can summarize it in an efficient manner? Are we trying to check to see how somebody's critical thought is or what they took away from it or what they found interesting. Sometimes those things get blurred together and we focus on a rubric of how we're going to mark an assignment. But we don't actually explain to students why we're trying to get you to do this thing and what we're trying to get you to learn. I think that goes a lot to some of the conversations we had in the first session about the culture of writing and what that means. We're expecting people to know already what we want in the participation of doing the assignment and not the why we want it. So it's challenging, especially if you come from a background not traditionally seen as having a role in academia, like what you want out of an assignment. There's lots of times where I'm like, I don't know why I'm writing this thing, so I don't know what to give you. When I hand something in and it was like this is interesting but not what I wanted. And I'm like, Okay, cool. I don't know what you wanted because we didn't talk about, we talked about how I would get marked and I read the assignments and I wanted to participate, but we don't know the why. And so I think a lot of these issues we're having with academic integrity can be solved by thinking through our pedagogy and why we're doing the thing that we're doing, challenging ourself with do we need to do that? Or can we try something new and be a bit experimental? I think the other big takeaway that I see in these sorts of spaces is the experience of being a student now is so diverse and many of us come from, we're really struggling in school. It's never been harder to be a student in my opinion. We are working multiple jobs. I worked full-time while going to school and I do that now because I have a full-time job. I don't want to quit to go finish my degree. And I make a joke that I paid for half of it already through a student loan and I want the diploma that tells society I can read really well, so I should just finish up. I achieved the goal I had going to university, which was getting a job. But there's a lot of, there's a lot of struggles students are facing today.

There's a lot of social pressure for students to enter college or university. You're told that that's kind of our ticket to getting a better job or to take ourselves out of poverty and so the growing number of students on campus or students who are non-traditional academic types, non-traditional university students. We're seeing that with the growing increase of international students or the ones with low financial need and low academic preparedness. Those are the, that's the group of international students that is the growing market. And we're all trying to tap into that market, but doing that and tapping into communities that have less traditional, less representation in post-secondary comes with a responsibility on institutions and all of our responsibility for to set up for success rather than not shaping the system around them. So Dr. Lam's example about international students and there's a lot of... of course we've all seen it about international students cheat more than domestic students. Do they cheat more because they don't understand the cultures of our campus and what cheating is? Or do they have higher stakes and can't afford to have a bad grade? I sit in classes with people all the time and the students younger than I am, who are, If I don't get an A in this class, I'm not going to go to grad

school or I'm not going to be able to go to law school. I always tell him you're going to get into a school. It's about making your application more compelling. There's lots of things you can do where you don't have to put the pressure on yourself to have a perfect grade at the end of your perfect four years to get into your perfect grad school. There's lots of opportunity out there, but students aren't seeing that that exists because of the pressures in the community in which we are. I get the experience of seeing it because I got to pause my studies and go back. And now I get to play this fun role of being in the middle, an observer of academia while participant in it. So that comes with time and being confident in yourself and your skills that I have because time has awarded me that and I've gotten to participate and practise these skills in an environment through my employment, but a lot of other students don't have those opportunities.

So it's really about creating a lot of these spaces where students can participate as equal participants to the academic community. Rather than being thought of as an afterthought or somebody we just invite to have. There's a lot of education councils or senates, for example, where you sit at the table and students around an academic committee. And they don't say anything. And it's not because they don't say anything because they don't know anything about what should be in the nursing curriculum, as an example. The conversation is such a high level in that space, nobody thought about how to create space for that student to participate. So we sit there and leave not feeling empowered because we got to vote on the senate committee, but that we were not able to participate and we put that on ourselves versus thinking about, well, how do we change the conversation so that we can participate in it and how can we be partners together in making spaces for everybody to participate. And it's not just students, lots of faculty from different backgrounds and different cultures also feel that when they're getting into school, whether you're a new instructor, whether you come from a marginalized background. There's lots of people who aren't feeling included in these conversations. And I think it's about finding ways for us to be partners with each other about making our campuses and then academia as a whole a thing that works for all of us. Which cuts down on a lot of the instances where people are using, are cheating or not meaning to cheat but not participating in academic integrity as we see it.

We need to challenge what is academic integrity to us. What is the role of a student like? What is the goal of the outcome we want a student to learn? And is that academic integrity policy and research showing that improve... working towards that goal rather than being a punitive thing where a student gets kicked out of school, for example, in the last presentation is a great one. It's like who's winning if a student gets removed from a class? Or who's winning if a student fails an exam and has to retake a class or gets kicked out of school? Like the institution is not winning, the faculty are not winning, and that student isn't winning. And their actions don't really impact the rest of the class. There's this rapid sort of individualism where students are feeling like they're competing with one another for whatever the outcome is at the end of their school, whether it's jobs, whether it's grad school, whether it's honour roll or scholarships, there's this competition in the classroom, but the end of the day, it doesn't really matter to me what the person next to me is doing or how they're performing in the class. It's about how I'm,

24

as an individual of going through my schooling and what I'm getting out of it and is what I'm getting out of it helping me for my goal and being supportive in a classroom where we can all achieve our goal no matter what it is. Some students like me go to school, and I'm constantly asked like we're you going to go to grad school and I'm like, I can't afford it. So nothing I'm doing here is leading me towards grad school. I barely want, I could barely get this stuff done right. But that's how people have viewed me based on my participation in a class. And so if that's how I'm being viewed by an instructor during my studies, we're not looking at the individuals as individuals. I've been put in a category of this is why this person is taking these classes or this is why they'd be good for that without thinking of the circumstances that are necessary for me and my academic journey. And so I think these conversations are really great. And what I've taken away from all of these discussions is how can we shape our pedagogy and our student experience to coalesce with one another. And how can we each be active participants in shaping what I think the future of academia will look like. I don't think that there's enough challenging in the system generally about... There's lots of individuals and we're all keeners in the room who are having conversations about this on an afternoon on a Wednesday. So we're the front-line people leading the cause. And I think that there needs to be a lot more spaces like this and a lot more people having these discussions about how do we shape this very old system, decolonize it, make it modern, make it useful for folks and to serve at actual outcomes of what we want to see as people who are in academia, out of academia. And so this is a great conversation to get those ideas going.

ANITA:
Okay, Jenelle. And really spending two hours with all of you has been quite easy. And definitely a learning experience. I wanted to very quickly take a couple of questions here that I see in the chat. So Marsha has a question for the panel and asking, as we look at culture and EDI. So maybe I'll turn to Subrata first and then Beatriz and Laurie can jump in. As we look at culture and EDI, are there steps that can be taken to decolonize our concepts, policies, processes in academic integrity to address equity?

SUBRATA:
Well, the first thing that comes to my mind is to being sensitive, I think, to the individual needs and expectations and conditions. I think that is the common thread running from what I was hearing from others as well. Being respectful, being sensitive, and being cognizant of the diversity that people bring. I think that is the first step. What else? And trying to be. I think from the last presentation, Dr. Lam's presentation like who is winning? Our goal is to solve the students and serve them well making a rich experience for everyone, I guess from teaching as well as learning perspective. So from that point of view, I believe that it is just sometimes you just generalize things. We jump the gun just to make those conditions. So yeah, that's all I'd like to say.

ANITA:
Beatriz, any thoughts?

BEATRIZ:
Yes, I can jump in. So this is a very critical conversation and myself as an international student coming to Canada and learning about the culture and identifying all these experiences, I think it's so important that the system is set in a way that promotes engagement. And here I think that one alternative pathway to achieve this is through restorative practices. There are interesting connections happening in Canada. For instance, MacEwan University. Because the restorative practices put human relationships as the centre, the need to connect. So we are coming, we left our families behind. We want to learn, we want to be better. We are going to face so much stressful situations and problems and issues. So finding a way in which we can connect with others and come back to our human needs and make that connection to academic integrity. I think it could be a very powerful path that, well, it's already working, but I think it could escalate through the system and that would certainly work in this direction to include EDI more consistently in policy.

ANITA:
Thank you, Beatriz. I think Laurie, I'm going to turn to the next question and bring you in here. And this is Leanne's question and it mentions, I'm curious if we have specifics separating plagiarism and contract essays from other types of academic dishonesty that these contract homework and exam taking. Some cultures demonstrate respect for expertise by quoting discipline experts, word for word. And this is considered a proper methodology for some who learned their foundational writing skills in other countries. Any thoughts that kinda connects with the previous responses there.

LAURIE:
Yeah, probably Subrata is the person on this call actually who is really the expert here. So certainly Subrata, please jump in. No, I would say we have to understand academic misconduct as a spectrum of behaviours that include plagiarism, but also include more developmental practices like patch writing, which those of us in writing studies-related fields would understand not as misconduct, but it's something as part of a developmental process. I've found it very useful as Leanne has phrased it in the chat to separate the kinds of behaviours that result from a lack of understanding, or sophisticated understanding or practice in applying these expectations, which are things that we can address through explicit enhanced instruction in what we're asking students to do to meet the expectations of academic integrity, what those expectations are, why they matter? A cluster of behaviours related to a lack of knowledge from what Leanne, and I would agree, are behaviours related to academic dishonesty, which are no more deliberative attempts to cheat. Now of course, we can also see those behaviours in the context of thinking of Dr. Lam's presentation. Students who feel like they don't have other options and perhaps could have been supported differently before we ended up in a misconduct type situation. So I'll hand things over in case Subrata or Beatriz wanted to add to that discussion.

SUBRATA:

Maybe, Laurie, No, I think you've covered it well. I'm not an expert on contract cheating. But like I was pointing out in plagiarism. I think it is a point on plagiarism. It is also important to contextualize why the student may have resorted to cheating or plagiarism, or was there a gap in communication, understanding all those kinds of issues need to be taken into consideration before. Is there any lack in the support system, the way the information was communicated to the students and also the background that student is coming from. Like was he... Were they aware of what constitutes plagiarism or cheating? Yeah. So I think it's all covered by what Laurie just said. I'm just paraphrasing.

ANITA:
Thank you. Thank you so much, Subrata and Laurie. And the third one, I'd like to take them being very mindful of time here, it's 11:57. We've been receiving questions from teaching faculty around artificial intelligence- powered detection tools. Are panel members open to sharing their thoughts and these tools? alternate suggestions on using these tools, etc.? This is a question that's come from Christina. So Laurie, maybe we should begin with you.

LAURIE:
Yeah. Thank you. I think Christina, Julia's already responded to Christina. And I would just reiterate that point. And I think I discussed this in my... I did, I did discuss this in my own presentation, so long ago. I'm always deeply concerned about an impulse to farm out detection to the same algorithmic processes that are built by people and will make faulty assumptions as Julia's articulated, where it detects faculty members own content as also AI produced. That's just, I think just an opportunity to re-up our policing model and then point the fingers erroneously and really harmfully at people without basis. It doesn't scale in terms of a response. Because if you have a class of 500 students, you can't do this individually. But I think that we have, we can have that kind of gut moment of thinking. I know about this necessarily, and asking students to explain their ideas. Ideally though we would be proactive and try to think about intentional assessment design that really doesn't lend itself to being boughtable. In these moments, like getting students to be mindful about the uses for the educative approach and also not writing prompts or setting assessments that can be easily chatted as possible. Those are our challenges. I think those are, those are better approaches than counting on the computer to catch, catch cheaters in these ways.

ANITA:
Absolutely. And recognizing it's 12:00, I must hand it back to Helena, but I just wanted to mention, and this again comes from Bretag et al.'s article where they mention about wisdom, the wisdom that's needed that we need to apply, implement, use to recognize academic integrity, the centrality, the importance of it within the academia. Over to you Helena. Thank you.

HELENA:
Well, there's nothing I can say, really other than thank you to the panel. Thank you for joining us. Each and every one of you brought some amazing insights and new things for us to think

about. I look forward to the next FLO panel. Maybe we'll have to keep this topic at the forefront because it seems there's so many other angles we can take to. So thank you to each of you. So get to Anita who coordinated this panel. I really am very thankful to you for putting together and for everyone who stayed with us for two hours. The time just went so quickly. So thank you for that. We really look forward to seeing your responses survey. Any feedback on how we can do it better. But specifically also what topics you want to hear about. Please, it's just three minutes. So everyone go out and have a wonderful Wednesday. Thank you.