Academic Integrity in Australia – Understanding and Changing Culture & Practice

1. Abstract/Overview
This proposal seeks to contribute to improvements in ethos, policy and programs in the important area of student academic integrity in the Australian Higher Education sector. This will be achieved through first gaining an understanding of current culture and practice in Australia via a comprehensive review of existing approaches, resources and policies. To address the issues and gaps identified and thereby bring about change to culture and practice we will develop and disseminate tailored resources and policy guidelines to the Australian context. The universities involved are Macquarie University, the University of Sydney, the Australian Catholic University, and Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. This project has a specific focus on nurturing student leadership to establish grass-root level student associations on academic integrity that will supplement the top-down approach of university management, as well as on understanding the cultural nuances that have an impact on the student behaviour in the context of academic integrity. The resources developed would be widely accessible through the OLT website for use nationally within the Australasian university sector.

2. Project Aims, Significant, Value, Outcomes and Rationale
Plagiarism, the term applied to the submission of work for assessment with non-original content, has been described as the “cultural antithesis” of the intellectual tradition (Sunderland-Smith, 2005) and so it is not surprising that, in line with reports of disturbingly high prevalence of plagiarism, there has been a corresponding increase in academic interest in plagiarism and other breaches of academic integrity (AI) (see White, Owens and Nguyen, 2008). Breaches of academic integrity are problematic for many reasons, but they are especially relevant because data show that dishonesty in a learning context predicts dishonesty as a practitioner. From a survey completed by 60 students in graduate-level business course, Sims (1993) found that the amount of academic misconduct reported when doing undergraduate study was strongly associated with self-reported dishonesty at work. Several lines of evidence suggest that breaches of academic integrity might be increasing:
• students’ work commitments during semester may affect their preparedness for different assessments (Song-Turner, 2008);
• simple opportunity: the advent of commercial “essay banks” which advertise online and the ease of cutting and pasting from electronic data bases means customised solutions to assignments are available at the click of a button (Cole and Kiss, 2000);
• opening up of the HE sector to more students has created a more diverse student population. A consequence is greater diversity in preparedness and in attitudes toward what is acceptable practice in terms of submitted academic work (Introduction, RFP for the current project);
The response to these issues has been by and large measured. Purely punitive responses are not necessarily fair or productive (Dalton, 1998). Not surprisingly, the published policies and procedures of universities show an increasing emphasis on an educative response (Bretag et al., 2011a). There is now a more concentrated effort on educating students; for instance many schools/departments across Australian universities now encourage students to pre-submit their assignments to Turnitin. Management’s response to alleged cases of misconduct has also become more nuanced, taking into account the experience and past conduct of a student being accused of such practice.1

The laudatory steps taken by the HE sector are still not sufficient. We particularly note the following five inter-woven problems that we intend to address in this project.
1. The resources developed to help students have been by and large in the context of citation and bibliographic style, with emphasis on how to give credit appropriately; this has not adequately been extended to other areas. For instance, solutions developed by two students to a mathematical problem need not be as different from each other as the essays two students write. The case of computer programs written to solve a given problem falls somewhere in between.

1 See for instance the Macquarie University Schedule of Penalties at: http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/academic_honesty/schedule_penalties.html
2. Current practice may encourage students to focus on how to avoid detection instead of focussing on their learning and developing academic literacy skills. An additional concern relates to false negatives. Any assumption that an essay that has passed the electronic checking cannot be plagiarised is incorrect, and electronic plagiarism detection may establish a false gold standard.

3. One of the explanations provided by students who use academically dishonest practices is that they find the course content not relevant to their future goals (Rudolph, & Timm (1998). A recent posted plagiarism video on youtube was “It's not like students are making a profit from that essay, they just wanna write a paper in which they have no interest as fast as possible so they can get on with their other courses' workload.” The corollary of this is that if the assessment is perceived to be relevant, then the students may be less inclined to cheat, hence assessment tasks need to be designed so as to be found interesting and useful by the students.

4. Despite the multi-cultural emphasis in higher education (HE), stakeholders at all levels have not yet come to terms with the culturally-laden aspects of academic honesty.

5. McCabe’s (1993, 2000, 2002) seminal work on the effect of honour code in increasing many measures of academic integrity has not been explored in any systematic way in the Australian context. While honour codes per se may not translate effectively in the Australian context, we can benefit from the lessons learned from two decades of research. The goal of this project is to better understand these problems, and develop a resource kit that can play an assistive role in tackling these problems in the Australian context. These resources will be deliberately made sufficiently flexible so that they can be easily adapted to the context of a different academic institution.

There is an urgent need to redress these and related weaknesses in our HE sector. The value of the proposed project lies in proposing study based on semi-structured interviews as well as focus groups involving students and staff in tertiary institutions to better understand this phenomenon in the context of a multi-cultural Australia, and provide recommendations that are both informed and well-founded as to how to enhance existing academic honesty/integrity policies, or even develop them anew if they are nonexistent. It will furthermore develop appropriate resources to support these recommendations that will be made widely available free of cost for use by tertiary education institutions in the Australasian region.

This project will involve the collaborative effort of four universities – three based in Sydney and one in the USA (Macquarie, USyd, ACU and Rutgers). The choice of the three Australian universities is based on three factors: (1) existing collaboration between investigators at these universities, (2) diverse student body at these institutions, and (3) efficient management of the project given the proximity of these sites. Professor Donald McCabe, the founding president of the Institute of Academic Integrity, and arguably the world’s foremost authority on academic integrity, is a partner investigator in this project, and hence Rutgers University where he works is a participating institution. This project will incorporate research, development and evaluation phases, with informed advice from area experts from a broad range of institutions both local and international. This will enable us to first understand the Australian context and develop resources that will help address the five problems outlined above, aiming to be best practice. We aim to provide broad scale dissemination of these resources for a sector-wide impact on the advancement of academic integrity in Australasian higher education.

**Outcomes/Outputs.** The deliverables of the project will be tangible:

1. A broad study will be conducted to identify the attitudes and practices of students and staff toward academic integrity seeking to identify cultural issues, including organisational, discipline-specific, regional and ethnicity-based differences and needs. The study will include qualitative data collection via focus groups and interviews at the participating organisation, allowing deep exploration of AI-related issues.

2. Concurrently, along with focus group and interview data collection and analysis, we will conduct an extended review of the literature and other relevant resources with a particular focus on cultural issues and comparison of existing policies and AI-related learning and teaching resources. These foci correspond to Kilber’s (1993) three means of intervention discussed later.

---

2 Over the last seventeen years Professor McCabe has done extensive research on college cheating, surveying over 165,000 students at more than 160 colleges and universities in the U.S. and Canada. He has also surveyed over 40,000 high school students in the United States.
3. A set of guidelines for academic honesty policies will be produced based on our study results (output 1) and review (output 2). HE institutions will be able to use these guidelines to develop an initial policy or to evaluate and refine their existing academic honesty policy. The guidelines will also aid benchmarking across the sector.

4. A suite of online and publicly accessible resources will be designed and implemented that seek to fill key gaps identified in the review of existing resources (part of output 2). These resources will seek to address cultural issues and topics that are not adequately addressed currently.

5. A special track of the 6APCEI will be devoted to academic integrity. Participants will be able to join in-person or remotely. This forum will be used to disseminate findings from the review of literature, policies and resources and gain feedback on resource designs and set of guidelines.

6. Finally, student leadership at the three universities, MQ, USyd and ACU, will be nourished and prodded to establish student societies on Academic Integrity. We envision these societies as the agents of culture change at the Australian Higher Education institutions. Unlike outputs 3-5 which are top down and driven by teachers, we want to take a novel bottom-up student-led approach to bring about cultural change in attitudes and behaviour to AI in Australian HE institutions. We expect these societies to engage in activities of the following kind (subject to the University rules):
   a. Have information booths on academic integrity during “Week Zero” and similar events, and actively recruit fresh students as members of the Society;
   b. Organize mock-trials (hearing by discipline committees at different levels) of student-actors pretending to have engaged in academic dishonesty. Appropriate academics and administrators with adequate knowledge should participate in such events to make them appear realistic;
   c. Regularly publish a newsletter devoted to articles on academic integrity issues mostly written by students. This can be used to disseminate anonymized information on recent cases on academic dishonesty dealt by discipline committees;
   d. Nominate student members for discipline committees at different levels;
   e. Provide peer advice and counselling to fellow students on related matters; and
   f. Provide suggestions and advice to relevant staff on related issues.

The focus group and interviews (output 1) will seek to gain information on how best to establish such societies and refine the role they will play. We will produce case studies for each of the three institutions which detail the establishment of these societies and their activities, which can be used by other HE institutions together with the relevant results from the study in output 1 to implement AI student societies in their own institution.

3. Literature Review, Approach and Theoretical Framework

With decreased funding from the Commonwealth Government, and uncapping the enrolment quota, universities are under pressure to accept more and more students. Universities also intend to attract more international students. Indeed, in today’s Australian academia, international students play a pivotal role. Potential international students make judgements about academic institutions in Australia in general – gross generalizations that are not warranted, but count nonetheless. Just as a couple of allegedly racist events can paint the whole of Australia in a negative colour, similarly a couple of well advertised events of academic dishonesty can in one go raise general doubt as to the standard of education as a whole. So there are two justified concerns: (1) as more students come, chances are the criteria for accepting students will drop which will likely lead to more cases of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty; and (2) dealing with alleged cases of academic dishonesty where the students come from a different cultural background is a very sensitive issue, and can very easily lead to allegations of racism in Australian academia which will have a negative feedback on international student recruitment. Hence there is an

---

3 Macquarie will host and fund 6APCEI, underwriting a loss of up to around 12K. Nayak has been seconded as a member to APFEI and will be the program chair. The conference will be held either in the last week of September or first week of October. McCabe has agreed to visit for 3 weeks to work on this project. His visit will coincide with this conference, and he will be the plenary speaker.

4 The ALTC funded project on Peer Evaluation of Learning and Teaching (PELT) led by Macquarie University recognised the importance of leadership in the success of PELT programs. We will be able to draw on the many resources as relevant to assist students to lead one another towards better AI practices. Richards was a member of the Leadership team on the PELT grant.
urgent need to better understand the phenomenon of academic integrity and take judicious steps to contain academic dishonesty.

Many studies have been conducted to unearth the reasons behind cheating in academic institutions. The reasons that Badge et al. (2011) identified behind plagiarism include: poor time management and poor study skills; deliberate attempts to improve grades; lack of understanding about the range of activities which constitute plagiarism, and uncertainty about how to avoid it; lack of understanding of the importance of referencing; and lack of understanding about how to reference correctly, e.g. around direct quotes, paraphrasing or more general citation. On the other hand, Rudolph and Timm (1998) noted that the most frequently cited reasons offered for cheating include: ignorance of academic dishonesty policies; different value systems; competition for admission to professional and graduate schools; low likelihood of discovery; course content seemingly not relevant to student’s future goals; lack of a relationship with the instructor; and faculty members’ failure to secure testing materials and assignments.

While Colnerud, et al. (2009) concluded that, ‘… the lower the degree of effort made… by the student, … the higher the degree of academic dishonesty,’ Rettinger and Kramer (2009) examined the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for cheating and suggested that issues relating to classroom contexts, such as teaching effectiveness and performance orientation, have an effect on cheating, with poor pedagogy and a performance-oriented teaching style causing students to consider that cheating is more justified.

The culture in which students study is also a factor in cheating (Rettinger et al., 2009). Students respond to socialised norms: if they believe that others cheat often, and that cheating is not taken seriously, they feel justified engaging in such behaviour themselves. Conversely, peer disapproval of cheating is associated with decreased cheating (McCabe and Trevino 1993). Olson and Mittler (1996) observed that special groups such as athletes, international students, students with disabilities, members of sororities and fraternities, and nontraditional students present special problems, and suggested that the sensitivity of the diversity should also be accompanied by a judicious sanction if determined guilty lest the judicial officer cannot but behave like “the carpenter who only has a hammer and whose remedy is to pound everything.” The importance of the classroom context should also be considered, as ‘improvements in pedagogy and an emphasis on mastery rather than performance goals’ make students more likely to feel that individual students should take responsibility for their own cheating, rather than blaming the teacher (Rettinger et al., 2009, p.311).

A small study at the University of Leicester suggests that students responded to a positive and prophylactic, rather than negative and punitive, approach to plagiarism (Badge et al., 2011). This included teaching students how to reference correctly, providing information on different activities which could be called plagiarism or academic dishonesty, providing regular reminders (e.g. before assignments were due), encouraging students to seek guidance from staff where necessary, and encouraging them to take responsibility for their work. There was an overall focus on encouraging a focus on good academic scholarship and academic integrity.

There is a broad agreement that academic integrity is best addressed through cultural change, involving students and staff in an integrated process that encourages and enforces academic honesty and scholarship. This view is enforced by the finding that students at honour code universities cheat substantially less than the “no-code” universities, as illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious test cheating</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious cheating on written work</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All serious cheating</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Self admitted Cheating summary statistics (from McCabe, et al (2001))
Features of an honour code could include: a focus on academic dishonesty; an emphasis on academic integrity as a major priority; a major role for students in educating other students about the code; and involvement of students on a judicial body established to deal with academic dishonesty (McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield 2002).

However, as McCabe and Pavela (2000) note, honour code universities tend to be small private schools, and “it is more difficult to develop and nurture a strong sense of campus community at large universities – an important foundation upon which an honor code tradition can be built.” Nonetheless, they reported that a form of modified honour code has worked in large universities in the USA, including Kansas State, UC-Davis, and Maryland. The results are quite impressive. Since Australian universities are comparable to large US universities, it is reasonable to suggest that such modified code can be adapted to the Australian context.

McCabe and Pavela (2000) suggest the following important features of the modified honour code which are very similar to those proposed by Pavela (1997):

• significant student involvement in designing and enforcing campus-wide academic integrity policies, and in educating other students about the importance of academic integrity;
• honour pledges may be used as part of a modified code … but they are not essential;
• penalties tend to be strict but have an educational emphasis. Often first-time offenders receive a temporary transcript notation, say XF (failure due to academic integrity violation), which can be converted to simple F after the student completes a unit on academic integrity;
• students are assumed to be capable of ethical development, and are engaged in substantive discussions about trust and honesty in academic life, and in the careers they plan to pursue;
• exams at modified-honor-code schools are invigilated, and students are encouraged to challenge – but generally are not required to report – offenders.

Kibler (1993) addressed the academic dishonesty problem from the vantage point of student development. The essence of Kibler’s proposal is provided in Figure 1.
education, the long period of training and the largely unsupervised nature of research, means that the institution’s agents (teaching staff) are more likely than usual to have shared value systems closely aligned to organisational values, in this case honesty, independent scholarship and trust. In a manner analogous to employees commencing a new job, students enter into a psychological contract with the university (and its agents) when they enrol: they enter into a designated degree trusting that they will be educated to a standard valued by employers, professional accrediting bodies and the community. Parallel to this, and probably to a greater extent than in employer-employee relations where it may be difficult to establish that content of the psychological contract, the university sets out what students are obliged to do both in terms of templates of required courses and academic standards (including the policy on AI).

### Approach and Dissemination: Methods and Strategies

In line with the outputs to be delivered, a range of methods will be used in this study. We will use focus groups and structured interviews to help us capture targeted qualitative data that will provide deep insights into the cultural issues. For development of the resources (including policy guidelines and multimedia modules) we will employ a design-based methodology (Wang & Hannafin, 2005) that involves a flexible, iterative process of analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation. The approach recognises the need for collaboration between researchers and practitioners in a real-world context, integrating a range of research methods from both qualitative and quantitative research paradigms to best inform the research. The method is also inter-disciplinary, recognising the need to bring together area experts in cross-cultural communication (linguists, psychologists, educationalists), multimedia design, technical production, higher degree research supervision, professional development, and systemic change in HE institutions.

The project is broadly divided into two stages of approximately six months each, preceded by stage zero, meant to set up the project (such as identifying and hiring personnel). The first stage primarily concerns data gathering and analysis, and the second will deal with development of the resources, and dissemination of the output. In each stage a number of tasks will be carried out concurrently in an interleaved fashion as given in the timeline. These stages are outlined in more detail below.

### STAGE 1. Data Collection.

**TASK 1.1. IDENTIFYING RELEVANT, DEEPER ISSUES FROM STAFF AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES.** Separate staff and student focus groups and interviews will be carried out to obtain a deeper understanding of the issues, cultural or otherwise, that underlie the “cheating culture,” and what can be done about it. Some questions will be targeting to get a picture of how students’ aversion to cheating can be positively utilised to start a bottom-up movement against academic dishonesty. The aim is to identify student expectations, preconceptions and concerns regarding academic honesty/plagiarism, outcomes/impacts of outside work, role of collaboration with peers; explore ideas about strategies to develop and promote academic integrity, including the idea of a psychological contract. This will involve:

#### Staff Focus Groups
- N=80: 40 experienced, 40 inexperienced, 40 academics, 40 tutors, staff from SIBT included, 3 university sites (4 if SIBT is counted separately)
- identification of issues
- identification of case examples

#### Student Focus Groups
- N=80: 40 local and 40 international students; 20 at each site; 40 in 1<sup>st</sup> year students, 40 final (3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>) year students

#### Semi-structured Interviews
- Semi-structured interviews, each approximately one hour long, will be carried out with the help of trained interviewers. As in the case of focus groups, a mix of student, staff and tutors will be interviewed. Parallel sets of questions, for staff and students will be developed in advance to accomplish this.
TASK 1.2. DATA ANALYSIS
Data collected in tasks 1.1 will be analysed using appropriate tools. Since the data is qualitative in nature, it will be analysed using a constant comparative approach (Thorne, 2000) which is often employed in Grounded Theory. Based on the result of this analysis, Tasks 2.2 and 2.3 can be carried out concurrently, feeding to each other. This will help us identify gaps that need to be filled in order to develop a comprehensive response to academic dishonesty. These gaps could be in our understanding of the problem, in the resources we have developed and made available, or in the relevant policies and procedures developed and implemented.

TASK 1.3. EXAMINING THE LITERATURE AND OTHER SOURCES FOR CURRENT EVIDENCE TO INFORM BEST PRACTICE
We will draw on literature from a range of disciplines relating to cross cultural communication, sensitivity and academic integrity. We will also examine online resources – relevant policy documents, project reports and other relevant materials such as videos will be researched.

STAGE 2. Resource Development and Dissemination

TASK 2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICIES
Based on the knowledge gathered in Stage 1, the project team will develop a set of guidelines appropriate for developing efficacious academic honesty policies appropriate for the Australian context. We will particularly explore to see what form of modified honour code policy will be appropriate in the Australian context.

TASK 2.2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE MULTIMEDIA RESOURCES
This task will be carried out in parallel with 2.1. Scripting, briefing of actors, directing and production of video-streamed exemplars, vignettes and scenarios will be carried out. Web and DVD resources will be developed, and case illustrations and tip sheets will be produced. Graphic design, layout, web design will be carried out professionally. These resources developed will support the policy guidelines advocated via Task 2.1.

TASK 2.3. EVALUATION OF RESOURCES AND PRODUCE REFINEMENT
Within the timeframe of the present project it is only feasible to conduct a short-term evaluation of the resources. This will involve surveys with staff, students and the expert working panel to provide quantitative and qualitative feedback regarding face validity and quality of the resource materials.

Longer-term evaluation to determine impact of the resources developed and disseminated on the student behaviour in Australia is beyond the scope of the present project but we intend to conduct such evaluations further down the track with participating universities.

TASK 2.4. DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABILITY

Dissemination. We will use both the Push and the Pull strategy for dissemination purposes. As to the Pull strategy, resources will be made available for download at the OLT website, at the project website housed at Macquarie (with links from other partner sites), and project reports submitted to the OLT. As to the Push strategy, we will organize a special track of the 6APCEI where ideas generated from this project will be presented and the resources showcased. We will also organize small seminars and workshops at different academic institutions to present ideas generated from this project, and have research publications and presentation at appropriate conferences/workshops.

The ready availability of the online resources will enable staff at other universities to adopt an innovative approach to academic integrity. An ongoing liaison with the project team will be maintained online to facilitate adoption. As the project progresses, more information will be made available to the potential adopters on the project website, via a news letter, as well as via the consortia Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) in the USA and the Asia Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity (APFEI) both of which Macquarie University is an institutional member of. This will help us progressively build a community of users, which can continue after the project is complete.
Methods for effective professional development and mentoring will be developed during the project to suit different institutional contexts regarding sharing and reuse. All project outcomes will be made freely and openly available as open content (using a Creative Commons license). The choice of the high profile Advisory Group will ensure the project has maximum impact throughout the sector outside the project team.

**Sustainability.** Although this is a one-year project, we foresee it as having a lasting effect, and hence plan to continue refining, enhancing and developing it. For this purpose we have a three-pronged approach. (1) We will nourish student leadership at the three Australian partner campuses to start academic integrity societies. These societies will sustain the discussion and debate generated, and contribution made by this project. (2) We plan to apply for an Extension Grant to the OLT after the tenure of this project. This will allow us to extend and finetune the work done in this project. (3) At Macquarie we already have an online special interest group (community of practice) of about 70 members. This group will be extended, proactively recruiting members from other universities, and we will seek funding from internal partner universities to establish a more permanent group.

5. **Project Management: Structure, Roles and Responsibilities**

The management structure has been designed to maximize the capacity to complete the project within the timelines and to provide an effective inter-disciplinary mix. Members of the Project Management Team have strong track records in management of substantial L&T as well as research projects to completion, and in reliable delivery of outputs. It also includes two early career academics (Cameron and McGuigan) as well as a world leader in academic integrity (McCabe), making the team well balanced. The project will be managed by the Project Management Team (the lead investigators), assisted by an Expert Action Panel (Reference Group), and a Student Consultative Committee. In addition, the team has been selected to reflect key stakeholders (Universities, Students, Deans of Learning and Teaching, Professional Development Institutes) in order to facilitate communication, dissemination, uptake and sustainability of use. The roles of key members of the project are:

- **Project Management Team**: Employment of staff, overall responsibility for project completion, adherence to timelines, reporting and production of deliverables.

- **Project Manager**: Day to day responsibility for implementation of the project, supervision of staff, liaison with project team members, conduct of literature review, writing of research reports, design of measures, coordination of design, editing, production of resources, and finally coordinate the activities of the Reference Group (Expert Action Panel).

- **Research Assistants** – conduct interviews and focus groups, data entry, data analysis, contribution to reports

- **Reference Group**: All project team members are by default members of the Reference Group. The project team members aside, we have obtained consent from a number of national and international experts in pertinent areas to be members of this group (see membership list in attached table). The role of the reference group members is not just advisory but requires active participation, providing expert information in identification of issues, informing development of materials, feedback on draft materials, contributing to the quality assurance processes, and monitoring progress of the project. The expert panel will meet two times, once in each stage, and will review materials between meetings.

- **Student Consultative Group** – participation in focus groups and advising on all aspects of the project.

- **Contractors**: The Learning and Teaching Centre at the Macquarie University will be employed to coordinate scripting, employment of actors, directing and production of video-streaming resources, as well as the web design and DVD production. This unit has extensive experience and expertise in this arena.
University support

The project has strong support from the Senior Executives at MQ, USyd, ACU and Rutgers. This will maximise participation in the project by staff and students. All the four universities are providing significant support to the project through payment for staff time of the project management group, and provision of office space, IT support, and IT equipment. Rutgers has agreed to relieve Professor McCabe for three weeks towards the end of the project to visit Sydney and offer first hand advice.

6. Evaluation strategies

This is a one year project, designed to be completed in two stages of roughly six months each. The first stage corresponds to the preparation and capacity building phases of the project; the second to the application and dissemination. We will commission a formal, independent evaluation of this project, and have set aside funds for this purpose. We are in contact with Professor Jude Carroll, a world leader on academic honesty, for this purpose; but things are not finalised yet.

Regular evaluation is built into the design-based research methodology and has been embedded into the project approach (see Approach section above). We consider this holistic, iterative approach to be necessary in order to ensure the success of the project. Throughout the project, extensive peer review will be undertaken by our Advisory Group. Input will also be actively sought from lecturers from various disciplines, researchers but especially students and student representative groups. It is expected that this will result in a project that has relevance for a wide range of academic communities across all disciplines, and a range of innovative and high quality resources and policy recommendations that will outlast this project. Additionally, we will commission a formal, independent evaluation of this project by an external independent evaluator and this has been costed into the budget. In the last two months of the project the evaluator will review all materials produced and participate in team meetings to provide feedback. He/she will write a final evaluation report at the end of the project. Key aspects to be covered in the evaluation of this project are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy of project implementation</td>
<td>What processes were planned and what were actually put in place? If any differences were identified, why did they arise? What amendments need to be made to achieve its intended outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy of data collection processes</td>
<td>How effective are the data collection processes in addressing project needs? How effective are the ethical procedures adopted in the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of project outcomes</td>
<td>What were the observable outcomes? To what extent have the intended outcomes been achieved? Were there any unintended outcomes? What? What factors helped or hindered the achievement of the outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of dissemination strategies</td>
<td>How will the data be analysed and presented to reach the key stakeholders? How effective were the special track at 6APCEI and other seminars in providing further feedback and refining the outcomes? What has been the impact of the dissemination strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>What evidence is there of change in work practices, attitudes or values; and/or organisational change? To what extent have students been engaged in the project activities? What measures are on place to promote sustainability of the project? What lessons have been learned and how will they assist other institutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Were deadlines managed appropriately? Was the planned timeline a good estimate of the time really required? What strategies were in place for risk management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Were any differences in budget expenditure identified? Why did they arise?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Details of Collaboration

This project involves collaboration of four academic institutions: three from Sydney, and one international. At the institutional level, the institutions contribute their staff time as well as other related
resources such as office space. On the individual level, it is a collaborative enterprise between academic professionals from different areas who supplement each other’s knowledge and expertise. The project team includes academics from Computing/IT (Nayak, Richards), Psychology (Homewood, White, Owens), Education (Solomnides, Cameron, Vallence) and management (McGuigan, McCabe). Considering that academic integrity is not a discipline specific problem, it is natural that any proposal to tackle it must incorporate the combined effort and expertise from professionals in different field.
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