The Research on Academic Integrity in New Zealand (RAINZ) Collective: insights into integrity, opportunities to build positive learning and teaching experiences

Transcript

- Attribution: The speakers and the Webinar must be credited or referenced:

  For example:

  Speaker Name/s, (2025, August 20). *Panel session: The Research on Academic Integrity in New Zealand (RAINZ) Collective: insights into integrity, opportunities to build positive learning and teaching experiences*, [Webinar]. Studiosity. https://www.studiosity.com/tracey

- Non Commercial: The conversation can be used for non-commercial purposes only.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:00:08] Kia ora, everyone. My name is Judyth Sachs, and I'm the Chief Academic Officer from Studiosity. And it gives me great pleasure in being able to introduce three esteemed academics from New Zealand, who are going to talk about a project that they were awarded the Tracey Bretag Award for Academic Integrity. But before I start, I'd just like to say that this is the fifth year that we have run the Academic Integrity Awards in recognition of Tracey's name. And it's really good to know that, in fact, a number of people who've been given the Award have worked closely with and have known Tracey well. And, Jason, you worked with and knew Tracey well, so I think many of us think that we have that question in our minds when we see things about academic integrity, particularly the description of it and the presentation of it in the media, what would Tracey say? What would Tracey do? What advice would we get from Tracey? So Tracey is both the leading light, but also the conscience for all of us in terms of ensuring that academic work, academic integrity is an integral part of our work. So I'm going to get the members of the panel to introduce themselves, Tell them, tell us where they're from. And then I've got some questions, but can I also invite people who are involved in listening to the and we've got 40 people already to if you want to ask a question put it in the Q&A, if you want to engage in chat and I'll be watching the chat and sometimes people put a question in in the chat so I'll, be watching that so that it becomes an interactive and a sort of reflective and engaging activity. So if I can say Jason, over to you.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:01:52] Thank you so much. Kia ora, everyone. Grateful to be here. Delighted and honoured, really. Yeah, Tracey was, as I noted in the LinkedIn post, a really guiding light for many of us in the field. And I didn't get to know her as well as I would have liked. And I think probably a lot of people could say that. She really was not just the embodiment of integrity herself, I think, as a person, but just so kind and open and welcoming. And so. Really a great spirit, you know, and I'm really glad that that spirit is living on in these awards and just so, so honoured along with all of my collaborators in the project to be selected. So yeah, my name is Jason Stephens. I'm a professor at the University of Auckland. I've been working on my American accent, so if I don't sound Kiwi to you, no, I moved here 12, 13 years ago now, but I'm originally from the US and. And yeah, just made New Zealand my home and the home of my family now. So we're delighted to be here and I'm delighted to be with you today and I'll turn it over to Lee for an introduction.

Dr Lee Adam [00:03:02] Kia ora koutou, ko Lee Adam Toka-Wendoya. Hi, my name is Lee Adam, and I'm from Ōtako Whaka'ihawaka, the, sorry, Whaka-Ihuwoka, the University of Otago. And my role here is now, as of February, Principal Advisor, Academic Integrity. Before that, I had a point two role as part of my full-time position as Director of Academic Integrity and so, you know, it's really great that it has become full- time. And I'd like to reiterate what Jason said about Tracey. I had the privilege of working with her on a couple of projects and she was such an inspiration and it's such an honour that our group received this award in her name. Thanks.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:03:58] Kia ora kato, I'm Neil Ulrich. I'm Executive Officer in the Office of the Provost at Massey University, where I deal with academic integrity, academic complaints, policy and process advice across the university. Can I just say that part of the purpose of the RAINZ Group is networking and communication and sharing knowledge. So. I really thoroughly appreciate the opportunity to share some of our work that we are passionate about and that we're very proud of. So thank you very much, looking forward to the opportunity.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:04:39] And I forgot in my enthusiasm to get this going, to congratulate you on what I believe and what the panel who assessed - we had about 25 applications - assessed the applications was this standout project and the one, the project that had both scale, impact and innovation. So personally from me, congratulations, but personally from Studiosity, this was well deserved. So I'm going to ask the first question to Jason. Can you describe the project?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:05:07] Yeah, and I have prepared a few slides and that might just help because of, you know, who doesn't love a visual. So let me go ahead and do that. Is that looking pretty good? Perfect. Great. So, yeah, RAINZ, and I will speak a little bit to maybe the triggering, you know, what really started this was that, you know, I had been going over to Australia quite a bit and really impressed with their national network and what they were doing, particularly with Bernie Marshall and what was happening. And it really was, and I, and, you know, I've also, you know, do a lot of work in the US and you see these sort of national collectives, you know, organisations, associations growing and a lot of,

you know, multi-institutional data sets, essentially, right?
Where a lot of institutes are getting together to work together on the problem of academic integrity. And we just had an absence of that. You know, there was, there was a network and there still is a network that in fact we're talking about later on. In New Zealand, and so I got up one night, it was like literally three in the morning, and I came up with this acronym of RAINZ, because I love an acronym. I'm an educational psychologist by training, and I need acronyms, otherwise I forget what things mean. So this Research on Academic Integrity in New Zealand, the RAINZ project, and so, I literally the next morning got up and went to the New Zealand network that was the equivalent of the AAIN that many of you would know, and and asked, you know, who would be interested in getting together? I want to really do the first, you know, multi-institutional national study of academic integrity. And I was just overwhelmed by the response. We had really eight institutions indicate interest. And there was a ninth, but they fell off kind of early, unfortunately. And you see them here, and you see the key people. Some of the personnel have changed a little bit, but the core remains. And so we really are a genuine collective of eight institutions, you know, each in a different sort of, with a different setting, but with a shared passion for promoting academic integrity. So when it comes to kind of what we, you know, what we envision doing is really first understanding the problem, you right? What, you know? You know, why are students cheating? You know, how many, what factors and forces, you know are at play, you know from the, from the broader sociocultural institutional factors down to the more immediate situational individual factors. As an educational psychologist, I'm really interested in moral judgments and moral functioning, but also motivation, that drive and direction that causes us to engage in behaviour, good and bad, I suppose. And that was the first part, but it was really all of us really cared deeply about making a change. This wasn't just a research project to understand the problem, but really an initiative and a group. And we're kind of thinking of ourselves now more of a community of practise for really creating, implementing, and evaluating possibilities for promoting integrity. I use some language there of choice architectures. I was thinking about nudge theory back then, but that's the heart of it. And so the first step of that was really doing a survey. And we did think several surveys. We wanted to survey students first and foremost, but also faculty. And more recently, which we're really going to launch in about a month and a half, actually, we're launching our second national study that's going to include a range of AI type questions. Of course, AI as an artificial intelligence is really, unfortunately, filling up our academic misconduct docket these days at many institutions. But we're also, as educators, introducing it and using it in meaningful ways for teaching and learning and assessment. So increasingly, this project of thinking about AI is looking at both permitted, legitimate, you know, educational uses. Versus those misuses where people are taking shortcuts and using them in unpermitted contexts. We want to really capture both of that and do a deeper dive including some qualitative work.
Now, I will say by way of wrapping up my long-winded description is that we did publish the results of that first survey, presented them in a couple of forums including the Australian Academic Integrity Network Conference. And got them published in Ensar. This is open access, so there's a QR code for you there. And that will describe essentially the results of the student survey. I probably won't

say any more about that now. I'm just gonna throw up the conceptual framework that really guides our work, which is sort of social cognitive in nature, but understanding behaviour as a function of. Know, person and environmental forces, a range of protective factors, right, that might protect against engagement and misconduct, contrasting there in red with the risk factors that are generally positively associated. And again, you can see all that in our study. So I'll stop there for the moment.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:10:45] So Lee and Neil, why did you decide to get involved in this project? What was the benefit and the motivation for both of you and your organisations? You're on mute Lee.

Dr Lee Adam [00:11:04] Of course I was, thanks Judyth. For me here at Otago, I think we had no data on what was really happening. We just have data on what we know students are doing, what we're picking up. And watching what was happening in Australia and the kind of data that was coming out of Australia and knowing that whatever was happening in Australia was probably happening here as well, but wanting the evidence for that. And for me, the reason I got involved was because I wanted that data so that it could lead change here, change across New Zealand, but also change here at Otago and our policy, our processes, and in particular, what behaviours to look for.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:11:51] I want to echo that. I look at life from an opportunity and a possibility point of view, and to me, there was such a huge opportunity to do what we as universities do as our core business, and that is to educate. And I think that the study lent itself, and the knowledge that we shared through the study lent itself to practises that facilitate education rather than punishment.

Dr Lee Adam [00:12:22] Yeah, because I think one of our really key findings was about where students are finding out about academic integrity. And so one of the things we found was that although peer influence was a huge influencing factor on students, they weren't finding out about academic integrity from their peers. So that was quite an untapped thing, particularly at Otago, but across... All of the universities involved, that we weren't harnessing the power of our students' associations.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:12:58] And I just put up those results to sort of show that, you know, that when you look at where you ask students about where their sources of learning about academic integrity policies and practises, you see some sort of typical sources, teacher discussions, course syllabi, maybe online modules. Some of us have required those at the University of Auckland, we do. But then, you quite shockingly, you student organisation association, right, at less than 10 percent. You know, and what Lee was alluding to there was that if you look at, you know, what actually drives and predicts, you know, behaviour, it really is peer norms. So we see this as kind of, you know, a very much of a missed opportunity. And, you know, when I said peer norms, so peer disapproval being strongly, you know, negatively associated with misconduct, as opposed to peer cheating behaviour, right? Positively, those are the protective and risk factors.

And those are. You know, really the strongest, you know predictors as it were, as you can see here in this sort of graph that again is in that publication.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:14:06] And I think also, if you look at the top end of that scale, the core syllabi and communication with academics, that's another opportunity is do we really engage and empower our staff who deal with these issues enough and give them enough to work with to make a real impact? In an area where students proclaim that they learn the most from.

Dr Lee Adam [00:14:32] And I think that result in particular led to us thinking and talking about a further initiative that hopefully we can still do down the track somewhere whereby we do tap into those student bodies and that peer influence.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:14:52] It seems from what you said, Jason, that the biggest surprise was the lack of knowledge and the advocacy by the student organisations. If you did the survey again now, would there be an improvement?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:15:10] That's a great question. And I hope so. And we're going to find out very shortly. Yeah, we are in our, right away when we did this in 2022, we planned a three-year follow-up, right? Little did we know that, of course, we finished the survey in October of 22, ChatGPT lands in November. And we had a question about ChatGPT, in fact, not ChatGPT, I shouldn't say that, but. And I'm digressing a bit, but we had sort of a pre-ChatGPT, but artificial intelligence question in that initial survey just sort of serendipitously. And it was 15%, 14.8 nationally. They said they were using some kind of AI illegitimately. So we're going to really see some interesting changes in that number for sure. With respect to students, in students, being a positive force with respect to being a source of learning for academic integrity. I hope we're going to see some changes. One thing that we've done at the University of Auckland, for instance, is we've tried to involve the AUSA, the university's association there at Auckland, and create academic integrity ambassadors. That hasn't gone as well as we'd hoped. But we are doing that. We're also participating and very active in the International Day for Academic Integrity that is sponsored by the International Centre for Academic integrity. And I should say, actually, that I am the vice president of research for that association and that the survey that we used and report in this RAINZ study is one that I helped develop as a member of that association. So this is, and I could give you international data, which I'm not gonna do in this talk here, but we do have an Australian university that's participated in that, but we've got data from now all over the world and building a data set. So one value of this instrument is we can do some international comparisons as well. I would love to hear what Lee and Neil would say to that question about students as a voice. Um you know a positive voice for academic integrity learning and understanding um because of that is something that you know for me is really critical. I went to honour code institutions in the United States for my education: Vanderbilt and Stanford in particular and there really was a sense of student ownership right that this it wasn't just some honour, we call it "honour code" there but let's say you know academic integrity policy that

was the university policy to regulate your behaviour. There's a sense of the students like, we own this. This is about, this is for us, about us. And, you know, that's a really powerful thing when you, because then it's regulated from within rather than from on high. And so I think we're a far away from that at the University of Auckland, mind you. And I'm sure we are at other institutions but that would be the goal, is for students to really feel like this is our code. This is this is for us. And we value it, rather than it being seen as university policy. Over to you, Neil or Lee.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:18:32] I totally agree. And I think it's such an untapped opportunity for us. You know, I totally agree with what Jason said right at the outset that the RAINZ group had become almost a community of practice rather than just a research group. And so we have these regular meetings where we brainstorm what we could do in the field to share more knowledge and to generate more ideas. And one of those things that we worked on or identified was peer-to-peer learning opportunities and we conceptualised a research project on that and we just haven't been able to generate the funding and so this prize that we won would go some way to further that. And that is acknowledging the power that lies within peer- to-peer learning in this field. I also want to reference you know at Massey University we had a few student association webinars on what they called the three AIs, which initially create a little bit of... fear/angst, because the third AI, so the first two are obviously academic integrity and artificial intelligence. The third one was avoiding investigations, and we instinctively were possibly a little bit concerned about that. But in the end, the messaging was pretty much 'do the right thing, and you won't get into trouble'. So they were very well attended webinars and we see the effects of that in the relationship growth between staff and students. So a powerful, untapped source and resource, I think.

Dr Lee Adam [00:20:17] Yes, and very much untapped here at Otago as well. And you know, that's something that now I'm full time working on academic integrity, something that I can certainly start to look into and to work on. And I think it was really interesting working with the RAINZ Collective and having these conversations and finding out different initiatives that are happening at different universities across New Zealand seeing examples of best practice. Examples of not such best practice and all of us sharing that information and figuring out how each of our institutions might move forward.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:20:58] I think I threw up this slide because this is some sort of you know we have this sort of idea of really a model based on some you know work that I did a long time ago actually from a handbook that Tracey edited but after I met her in Australia back in 2014 or so. She invited me to write a chapter and I developed this model for the chapter and and talk about certain levels of intervention. In the interest of sort of a holistic approach to promoting integrity. And so with Neil's help, in particular, we started framing that around, what are we doing? What are some of the ways in which we can use this three level model at these three different columns, if you will, with the institutional climate, the peer norms, and the moral attitudes? And so this is just sort of a rough outline that we created for this talk today of trying to sort of document

what we're doing. One of the things that I'm hoping is gonna happen next year, because we're moving back to more invigilated tests again, right? Because with the rise of AI, and I see somebody had a Q&A up there about, what do you do about misuse in the age of AI I think. And the reality is, is that you can't prevent obviously students from using artificial intelligence. So I'm with Danny Liu at Sydney and believe in kind of a... You've got to have a two-lane approach or something like it where you say, look, this is something we really care about assessing, and we want to know that that person can do it and do it on their own. We need to invigilate. We need bring them on campus and test them. And this is where I want to bring in students too. I want these integrity ambassadors to also be maybe part of our invigilating staff. We're really understaffed in that space and train them to be sort of involved in not only promoting integrity but also involved in overseeing the process. That might sound radical to some here, but if you go back to honour codes in the U.S., that's how, often, it's done. There is what's called a non-toleration clause, and we're not supposed to just sit by and watch other people cheat. And moreover, I sat on academic integrity panels and the judicial panel making policy. At the universities, you know, that I worked at and was a student at, you know, overhearing cases and leading cases, in fact. So there's a lot more opportunity for students to get involved and, you know, and that really works. I think that would influence both. Not only there, if you work in this space here, you're, you know directly and indirectly affecting institutional climate and moral attitudes. So, it's a real win and I think this is that missed opportunity that we started with. The more we get students involved in feeling like this academic integrity is for them, and it really is their policy, their code as it were, the more powerful I think that force will be and more successful will be in hopefully seeing integrity and not processing cases of misconduct.

Dr Lee Adam [00:24:16] Yeah, and I think it just reframes academic integrity as a whole for students. Because, you know, my view on our academic integrity policy and my role supporting that policy here at Otago is that I'm here to support students who want to get their degree honestly and do the learning that having that degree indicates that they have done so that they have the skills and knowledge that their degree says that they have when they graduate. And I think harnessing those peer norms and things can really help to get that message across to students who potentially currently see academic integrity and academic misconduct processes as a kind of a catch and punish that we're out to get them rather than seeing it as supporting their learning.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:25:07] Exactly.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:25:08] We've got a question from Reagan O'Malley who's curious about the survey of students and how much academic misconduct you think might be under reported with this approach. Presumably these were anonymous responses, but to what extent do you think might represent the tip of the iceberg?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:25:25] Yeah, Reagan, great question. And absolutely, I would have to say, you know, I'm showing this sort of method slide. So yeah, this

is a cross-sectional anonymous survey. And we used different institutions because of had different constraints and with ethics and so forth. At a couple of them, University of Auckland included, we were able to do, you know a stratified random sample of 10,000 students of our roughly 35,000. Uh, and so we were able to really check to make sure that the sample we had was, was more or less representative, right? Cause you're sampling from a population. The problem is, even when we were giving away prizes and so forth, $100 gift certificates, and we pushed hard for two weeks with three or four reminders, we had a 30% response rate, which for online surveys is incredibly good. But think about that. That's a 70% non-response bias then. 30% sounds great. But then seven out of 10 people didn't answer it. And why didn't they answer it? So I can say that, hey, overall, the sample looks good. Representative that is by way of gender, year of study, ethnicity, so on and so forth. But still, we're not hearing all the voices. And I'm afraid some of those voices we're not hearing obviously would have implications for the numbers that we see. You know, right? So overall nearly two thirds of our students. Um you know reported engagement in at least one of the 24 behaviours we asked about. We had one institution that was very low at 40 percent um and in and another but the rest of us were all i say the rest us because often included were north of 60 percent all the way up to 70 there was only one that was that was the that had less than a majority um who were said that didn't do something. So, yeah, I think these numbers, to answer your question, probably don't reflect the reality and the reality is a bit higher still.

Dr Lee Adam [00:27:38] Yeah, and going back to the different responses from different institutions and the different ways that the survey was pushed out, that was probably the biggest challenge that we faced as a collective was that different universities had different policies on what students could be surveyed on, who could administer those surveys, who got to say whether or not a survey could go out. Some institutions had a specific number of student surveys that could go out each year, and if that cap had already been reached, then they couldn't send the survey out. Some institutions like Otago, we were able to send the surveys to all of our undergraduate students, and that's partly in thanks to my colleague, Joe Gibson, who made that happen. But other institutions were limited in who they could send the survey out to, so they could only choose a sample to send it out to. So I think one of the strengths of what we did, given that difficulty, is we kind of just went with the flow with that. So we wanted data. And we wanted each university to get as much data as they could. And so each university worked within the constraints of what they could do to get the most responses possible without compromising our research integrity, our research methodology. So, you know, that was certainly something that we had to work around and already in the planning for our next survey going out next month or in October, we are facing the same difficulties that our institutions have different requirements and also requirements for ethical approval to actually collect the data in the first instance.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:29:26] Yeah, we actually had one institution right that wouldn't even allow them to email at all. So they had to do go old school kind of and put, you know, printouts with QR codes on bulletin boards around campus

to recruit students. I will say, you know, I love doing the stats and stuff, you know, that it was remarkable that despite all these different sampling approaches, the reliabilities, you know, across the inst..., I did individual. Confidential individual reports for every institution and then one collective, you know, aggregated report for every, for all institutions and that was what we published out of. But everybody owns their own data. I was the one as the PI to aggregate it, analyse the data and provide individual institutional reports so they could, you, know, use those for their own policy and decision making. But I can say that despite all these differences in sampling and sample size, that the reliability and validity of the factors that we used were very strong despite those differences, which I was worried about.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:30:36] You mentioned that the survey went out in 2022, post-COVID. What sort of noise do you think that COVID experience and the sort of working from home, studying from home had on students' responses, but also students' understanding of academic integrity?

Dr Lee Adam [00:30:58] Great question. That's not something we've really discussed as a team, but my feeling is that COVID very much changed the way that everybody worked. And I think that one of the ways that came through in the survey responses was the response to a question regarding the use of or the unauthorised use of genitive AI. So using gen AI to do your work and then submitting it. I think, you know, that was probably quite... An indication of the way that students were really doing everything online and they were finding tools. Because, you know, before the media really heavily promoted ChatGPT when it was released, 15% of our respondents said that they were using ChatGPT to prepare assessments that they then submitted.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:31:48] But not only that, I think also one of our findings was that the most prevalent type of breach was collusion. And I think that was an important flow out from COVID and the situation that they found themselves in doing assessments from home and not maybe personally being invigilated.

Dr Lee Adam [00:32:12] Yeah, and I think there was also, for me, surprising number of students who said that they had engaged in impersonation and exams. They had either impersonated somebody or had asked somebody else to impersonate them. And I wonder if that was more related to the online examination environment than the in-person examination environment, where that's much harder to do.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:32:38] Can I just ask a different type of question now, and it's about the support you receive from your institutions. During a time of stringent budgets, sometimes symbolic support is more important than the sort of the financial support, but what sort of support, acknowledgement and encouragement did you receive from your institution? And the fact that you got all of the institutions except one to participate.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:33:05] Yeah, let me go first on that one just because of I have to say I have been actually so pleasantly surprised even shocked I would

say with how the University of Auckland has been and treated me over the years because before the RAINZ even project I had done surveys on you know evaluating their academic integrity course their required module and I met with you the then, you know, provost and and so forth, and they've just always been so supportive. So when I came up with this RAINZ initiative, I went to the Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic, Bridget Kool, who was just so supportive and the Academic Quality Office led by, well, their staff, David, Nissa, they have been incredible, allowing me to do that stratified random sample. Um, are, uh, they gave us $4,000 or part of it was like, well, no, was it four? It was, I can't remember what it was, but thousands of dollars for gift certificates and so forth. So they were, I've been really impressed and surprised and, uh and, and just really happy and, you know, uh yeah, I, I have to say that I better than probably most institutions, um, would, you, know, because of, and they've been really open about me sharing the data and publishing the data. You know, when it was strictly University of Auckland data, you know this 2021 article I'm referring to. So they've been great there with Neil has been really instrumental in terms of making our collaboration official. So we have the you know the lawyers from all the universities sign a collective agreement and Neil I'll turn it over to Neil because I think you know Massey and with Neil's leadership there, have been really supportive of the RAINZ Collective and everything that Neil's been doing there at Massey.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:35:03] So over to you Neil.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:35:05] I agree with Jason, and I think, you know, we are we are very small group, but we rely on the support of so many others. And where we've been really, really fortunate is that the senior level of sponsorship, or support of our work at Massey, the Provost has been absolutely unbelievable in terms of supporting the work that we do, and facilitating the work that we do, and likewise, those who have to load and distribute the surveys and collect the results from the surveys, etc. And facilitate opportunities for us to speak, for example. So, the team is a whole lot bigger than just the 10 or 12 of us who regularly meet as the RAINZ Collective. You know, those who helped vet the collaboration agreements, etc., they all play a very essential part of the work that we do.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:36:07] From what you're saying, it also gives legitimacy to the project. The fact that the lawyers have got in to actually make sure that you are protected and safe. The fact that the Provost is a great sponsor. That's given you legitimacy, but it's also given you a profile and a sense of we're real about this.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:36:29] Absolutely. Yeah, and I was, you know, I got to speak before all of the Deputy Vice Chancellor's Academic at the national level in the NZQA, the New Zealand Quality Assurance, you know, Association down in Wellington, you knew, flew me down for a talk, to talk about our study in our work. So there's been a lot of absolute, you know, yes, support from Yeah, from the leadership of most institutions, I would say. And Lee could say a little bit

about what's happened to Otago there with even her new position that she occupies is really itself a reflection of institutional support.

Dr Lee Adam [00:37:10] Oh, absolutely. I had huge support from people here at Otago. In the first instance, I've mentioned Jo Gibson before, she's the Director of Student Experience here at Otago, she was hugely supportive to make things happen and get this survey through and she was part of the original collective as well. But not only that, the DVC Academic at the time was really supportive and like Jason's experience in Auckland she made funds available so that we could offer a prize draw for students who filled out the survey and when we had the results I was invited to present the results to Senate which is you know the body that oversees the Vice Chancellor, and everything that happens here. So, a massive amount of support and it couldn't have happened without that support.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:38:09] And I think what's inspiring for me is, sorry, Judyth, that I can't really say it's a blueprint. This has been done before, but the recipe that we follow in terms of the collaboration across universities is being replicated in other areas. So just recently, the New Zealand universities have formed a similar collective in relation to research integrity. And that's hugely exciting to be to be part of for institutions to talk together, to learn from one another and to and to build collectively more than what we could do individually.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:38:51] I'm interested to know, I mean, New Zealand is a small entity. Could you actually, could the same thing be done in Australia with 40 universities? Do you think that you would have the same success here? And if somebody, you know, the Australian Academic Integrity Group decided to do a similar thing, what advice would you give to them?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:39:18] Great question. I mean, Australia, look, I think I have, I couldn't say enough about Australia because they are the the leaders, I think, in the world for promoting academic integrity. The gateway there, of course, being like the McMaster scandal and the focus on contract cheating. You know, if I had a criticism, I would say that it was that there was almost like an over-focus on contract cheating, bad as it is, as the most egregious form of academic conduct, don't get me wrong. But it's also, you know, the minority report, you know, right? It's not, there's, that tends to be one of the, you know, it's a rare thing, you know, Guy Curtis's stuff, I loved his, you know, what he does in that space is wonderful work, you know, The Bayesian Truth Serum and his article on that. But you've got people like obviously Phil Dawson, you know, Danny Liu, you've got Jason Lodge at UQ who's like an amazing assessment guru, so you've really got a a network of scholars there that if they got, if they wanted to, they could and they got together, they'd be a formidable force and they could easily, I think, pull it off. You know, what exactly they'd wanna pull off would obviously, you know, be up to them. But that's, I totally think that it could happen. Yes, Australia's, what is it, five times bigger by population than the... That's what makes New Zealand and doing a national study here so feasible. Obviously, as you increase five-fold, you're gonna have probably some more challenges, but I totally think it could be done. If you wanna know a little bit

about what I think is like by way of a process, let me see if I can pull up that slide. I've sort of lost my slides here for a minute. You know, this is something I developed years ago. I had a Templeton Fund grant, and we were, I was working with high schools at the time. But this totally holds for universities as well, is when you want to think about, and you can think about this as like within institutions, but I think even for what the question you're asking, Judyth, you know, about getting together, you know an international collaboration. The idea there is obviously is getting a group together, a group of stakeholders, shareholders, right? At the institutional level, that includes students. It includes professional and academic staff from your various departments. This could be, at our high schools, it tended to be around 12 people. We wanted representation from each level of each grade of school, for instance, and so forth. But you get those people together and you do a survey like the one that we've been talking about to find out, you know, Okay, you know let's say our vision is to understand misconduct and promote integrity, right? Let's do a baseline survey to really capture what's going on there. And then that then will feed into us developing a set of objectives and an action plan. That we then want to build consensus around. So then we go out to our stakeholders and our children and say, hey, what do you think about this? So get buy-in for what you're thinking about with all of the requisite folks that would be involved and affected. And then you start to play out that plan, implement it. You really gotta have, we set a three year horizon, right? That's why we're doing this three year follow-up. Is because this takes time before you then wanna assess. You're talking about changing a culture, right. That's a big undertaking. I mean, three years is modest. Yeah, you can initiate some new programmes and policies, but for them to actually take root and transform business as usual, that's quite a... That's quite an undertaking, changing a culture. But anyway, you do that and then revisit, times change. We got COVID and then now AI. I mean, this is a dynamic space with respect to the challenges. This is not something, but this is a model you can think about using forming, informing, development, building, implement, assess. That's my recommendation.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:43:26] No, and I think that's actually, that's clear. It's defensible, it's transparent, and it delivers results. So for me, if I was back being a Provost, that would certainly be something I'd be interested in. I've got a question here for, it's a comment from Amy Milka, but I think it's worth putting to the group. The question of resourcing extends beyond running a survey in order to close the loop and take action on the fantastic evidence base generated by a survey, significant institutional resources are also required. What are they and who has to be the champion?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:44:06] I can say briefly with with Auckland what we have. And again, this is sort of happens. It was happening already because of Auckland has been really proactive. I think we were the certainly the first in the country, maybe in Asia Pacific to require students to take an online course right for academic integrity, but we have a standing academic integrity community of practice and have for years now. I was the inaugural convener of that group and It consists of 60 academic integrity advisors. So we have five faculties. And so there are roughly 10, let's say on average, AI advisors from each faculty. And we

have, we meet about four times a semester, so about eight meetings a year. And we're continually revisiting practises and policies. So that is... So, the locus of this for us is definitely the communities of practise, and they feed into the faculty teaching, or the universities teaching and learning quality committee, right? So, we're really kind of, that's who we sort of, and sometimes it works back and forth where we make recommendations to them, sometimes they come and say, hey, we want to know more about this, because we're thinking about changing some policies around teaching and learning. So I think that is obviously a great question, and you do need to have some kind of association or organisation like that that really can be both a sounding board and a generator of ideas and an overseer of ideas for academic integrity. I should say, too, our academic quality office, our AQO, really oversees that. So that's how it's structured at the University of Auckland. You know, Neil and Lee, what do you guys have?

Dr Lee Adam [00:45:58] So here at Otago, we have an academic integrity advisory committee, but the value of the data that we collected from the survey in 2022 actually allowed me to make an argument for what is now my full-time role. So it provided part of the reasoning for this role, and so I was able to make the argument that the number of students who are engaging in a behaviour that we deem to be academic misconduct poses a significant institutional risk. So it's a risk to the value of our degrees. It's a rest to the reputation of the university. And so when you put that beside my salary, that could quite potentially help mitigate that risk. And in consideration of how much the university spends on marketing each year, you know, it was kind of a no-brainer.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:46:58] But I also think that the benefits that we get from learning from studies like this makes up for the resources that we have to spend. So one of the examples of something that Massey did following this survey was review our academic integrity policy and procedures. And that was a massive shift from something that was perceived to be punitive to something that's very highly focused on, um, educative interventions. So one of the, one of the things that flew that that flowed from there was that we increased the number of our academic integrity officers from five to 33, because we realised that the relationship and the educative opportunity sits with academic staff rather than a central committee issuing a penalty or what's perceived to be a punitive outcome. So there's investment, I think, into education, and that spans across the whole university.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:48:17] Yeah, and also too, I would add there that is having really a means for help, you know, because of the academic staff are on the front lines and having to identify these cases, it can be a terrible amount of workload. So about four years ago, even before the right around the same time we were doing the RAINZ started it, you we developed and we use a product from simplicity, I think it's called. But it's the, we call it the AIMS. It's the academic integrity management system. So it's a lot more easy for staff to report. And for us as academic integrity advisors, because I'm one, you know, when we have a case, it's just everything's online, templates are automatically generated, letters to student, just case management becomes much more

manageable when you have an online-based system like that.
So highly recommend that. I know they're using it in places in Australia because that's who was using it. I think it was Melbourne or somebody. It could have been Monash, but we asked what they were using, and it was this Simplicity product. It's called the Advocate, I think it's called, but really helpful.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:49:23] Look, what I'm hearing, and your success has been, you've been able to inculcate the view and you hear it, but yours has actually got material benefit. Academic integrity is everybody's business. And by being everybody's, you've got to have the culture, the structure, the processes and the resources all joined up and all connected. How do you get that to happen?

Dr Lee Adam [00:49:48] I think it's important to note that apart from Jason getting a small amount of funding for incentives and me getting a smaller amount of money for incentives, we did this with no funding. So it is absolutely possible. It was just a group of really committed, enthusiastic people who wanted the data.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:50:07] Yeah, and having supportive leadership. I mean, really, that does matter, you know, I mean it hugely, you now, right? I mean there could have been so many roadblocks put up and concerns about institutional risk and reputation, you know that, you and that's how most places, you know I had a four million or not four thousand dollar grant, you about 10 years, well it was more than 10 years ago. I had to knock on 40 high school doors, so I started this work at the high school level. To get even two high schools to join my project. They wouldn't touch me with a 10 foot pole because they didn't want somebody coming in there snooping around and finding out about academic integrity or academic misconduct at their school. But I think that that's exactly right. Money can help and no doubt about it, but it doesn't really take much. What it takes actually is leadership. You know, and commitment and people being, you know, seeing the importance of this and having a longer term vision; than worry just about, you know covering my bottom today, right? And not, you not getting, not exposing sort of, you know, unpleasantries today, you know, right. And seeing that, no, this is really important. And we've got to build towards cultivating, you know, what really matters and not hiding, you No. You know, things today, so not very elegantly put there, but I think you get my drift.

Dr Lee Adam [00:51:37] Yeah, and I think it's important to note that, you know, each of our institutions, you know, could have said, actually, we don't want to know, we don't this data, we don't you publishing this data because, you know, actually it might not reflect that well on us. But, you know, I think it's quite a measure of how all our institutions want to move forward, that they were happy for us to proceed and, you know, to make that New Zealand data public in the article that we published.

Prof Jason Stephens [00:52:08] Yeah, I often think of, I'm writing a chapter now for a handbook of, and really there's sort of three levels of risk here, and especially with AI as the way I see it, if academic misconduct goes unaddressed,

right? You end up with not only a problem of student decreases in engagement and achievement or what we're looking for, obviously compromises in integrity. But jumping down, this is what Phil Dawson talks about is that we're talking about invalidating assessments of learning. The marks then just become noise and not signals of student achievement. And that becomes very quickly a problematic situation for you know our reputations as institutions because of you know the degree at what what value is a degree you know that is uh you know, that is earned on false pretences as it were? You know on noise and not signal from from the assessments which is why you know you do need we need to have a a kind of Danny Liu style two-lane approach that really says okay this is the stuff that really matters, these are the gateposts. Students need to pass this test under these conditions to really earn that degree so we protect, you know, our reputations and the value of our degrees.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:53:35] Dr. Javad has asked an interesting question. He's making an observation that, you know, you've presented the data and the statistics. But could each of you give an example of one successful intervention that's come from this project, that's actually helped to improve both students' understanding of academic integrity, but also the institution's commitment and demonstrated response to academic integrity?

Prof Jason Stephens [00:54:04] Yeah, that's a tough question, you know, in terms of, you know, could demonstrate and prove this kind of language. You know, we're not we're not doing, randomised control trials here, you know, right, probably could be that would probably require some more money to do some more rigorous research. And again, we are not, oftentimes these interventions we're talking about are, to policy and practises that really play out over years. We're not talking about, hey, I got a three-week intervention here pre and post, and this is going to change this student. I now have done some of that work, that said. Check out the work I did with Tricia Bertram Gallant. We just published an article in 2024 where we had a, again, it was quasi-experimental. It was students who were caught cheating and then processed, took an academic integrity course that Tricia runs at University of San Diego, and we evaluated that and saw movements in ethical awareness. That's published in the [00:55:14]Journal of Moral Education, [0.6s] also open access. But search my name and Tricia's and you'll find that. So that kind of work exists out there. That is not something that the reins itself has done. So our evidence is, yeah, a bit more naturalistic. In terms of the studies that we're doing and more anecdotal. Now, that said, we're hoping this three-year follow-up that we are doing this year with these widespread surveys are going to perhaps provide some evidence. But again, these are going be different students, right? Because it's three years later. So this is not a tightly controlled experiment. This is educational research, a lot messier. For those that come from the STEMs and they want to a controlled study with experiments and randomisation of people to treatment and control groups ain't happening here.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:56:07] And that probably, if I'm sitting in my seat when I was Provost, I'd actually want, can you give me some examples of good

practice? And what's some, have you got some examples of good practice that have emerged from the conversations both between the collective, but also in terms of the data that you've been able to get? And I'm going to ask Lee that because I think that being a slightly different university and in the very south of New Zealand, there could be a sense that you could feel isolated, but you're not.

Dr Lee Adam [00:56:40] No, absolutely not. I think the information that we got from the survey has informed enhancements. I call them enhancements to our academic integrity policy and our academic misconduct processes. And that work is ongoing. So at the moment, we are looking forward to getting the data from this year to see if anything's changed. And as we discussed previously, in particular, we will be looking at things like where are students getting the information from? And so at Otago, that is an area that we do need to address, and that we don't have a university-wide academic integrity module that students have to complete. We do have the EPGM modules, the ones that Tracey Bretag led in the first instance. But they are not compulsory and they are implemented into some papers by specific lecturers and there is a we have a paper that all Otago students can access called UniO 101 and those modules are up there and so students can be directed to them, but certainly that's something that I'm going to be looking at, is how can we get these messages about how to do your work with integrity out to students? And that's why it's really imperative that we do this follow-up.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:58:11] We've got two minutes left, so I want to ask each of you the big learning from this project. The big learning that your Vice Chancellors would have said, that's fantastic and I can go out into the community and let people know what legends we are. So given that you're on the screen, Lee, what's the one big learning that you've got?

Dr Lee Adam [00:58:30] Oh gosh, nothing like putting me on the spot.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:58:31] I'm good at that.

Dr Lee Adam [00:58:35] For me, one of the big learnings was how ready students seem to be to tell us what they were doing under that protection of anonymity and also something that we haven't really covered here in this session about the data is we also asked students why they engaged in particular behaviours. And some of those responses were really interesting. Some of them were about basically being disengaged from their learning for whatever reason. And so they're really big ways that we can make a difference. We can, you know, find out why students are disengaging and find out how to address that. So I think the big learning is now we have some data, we can do something about these issues.

Prof Judyth Sachs [00:59:26] Excellent. Neil, but you're going to have to be quick.

Dr Neil Ulrich [00:59:28] I want to agree with that. For me, the main learning is if we want to start a journey, we need to start it. We've provided some insights and these insights say students learn from their lecturers. So we need to empower them, we need to support them, and we need give them things like template letters and flow charts and tone of letters that is facilitative of an educative approach. But similarly there are untapped resources in student advocacy and student associations - just start the conversation, talk about academic integrity, because ultimately, that's how you grow a community.

Prof Judyth Sachs [01:00:05] Jason.

Prof Jason Stephens [01:00:08] Yeah, so many things I could say. But one is that, look, this is a real problem, right? You've got two-thirds of your students doing some kind of form of misconduct. So what's the implication there? I look at a lot of the behaviours, and I say a lot these like, that could be prevented or at least mitigated through either better teaching and learning or better early assessment practises. So I really do think that we have a lot work to do as institutions, in terms of tightening that up and reducing opportunity, right? Because that to me, in some cases, we're just tempting students. People who know my stuff would know that I take the view that cheating is natural and normal, but unethical and evitable. And so it's up to us, the choice architects, as it were, of these institutions, to create environments that promote integrity and discourage and even actively prevent where possible misconduct.

Prof Judyth Sachs [01:01:08] And I'm going to have to close off our conversation and our discussion. And I'd like to thank the three participants for your giving your time and your insights and your expertise. But I also want to thank the people in the audience who made some interesting comments, but also asked some good questions. So enjoy the rest of your day. And there's another New Zealand only podcast in the next few weeks. And it's about internationalisation and international students. So we'll see you on the screen again and enjoy the rest of your day.

Prof Jason Stephens [01:01:37] Thank you so much. Thanks everybody.

Dr Lee Adam [01:01:39] Ka kite anō.