

# A tale of two cities: Implementing a developmental approach to academic integrity in two Australian universities



**Craig Whitsed**

*Murdoch University*

Email: C.Whitsed@murdoch.edu.au

*Category: Non-refereed*

**Douglas Colbeck**

*University of Tasmania*

Email: Doug.Colbeck@utas.edu.au

As Australian universities expand further into the global international student market and move to widen their participation pathways to realise the Bradley (2008) targets for increased participation in higher education, academic integrity is likely to come under increasing scrutiny. Recent AUQA audit reports have highlighted the need for Australian universities to ensure that their systems and management of academic quality are robust. Universities in Australia have therefore been forced to evaluate and in some cases reconsider their approaches to academic integrity. This paper reports on the activities of two Australian universities of similar size and composition and how they have responded to the increased challenge of maintaining flexible, robust and relevant policies and procedures to address academic misconduct. It is demonstrated that in both cases an underlying value steering their repositioning has been an emphasis placed on a developmental approach to academic integrity to foster 'the ethical student' by focusing attention on scaffolding students' understanding of the expectations and conventions of academic scholarship in their contexts. While both universities share similar goals they have embarked on two different strategies. This paper first outlines how University of Tasmania employed 'Turnitin' and an Academic Writing Module as an institution wide strategy aimed at assisting students to understand academic integrity by developing their academic skills. Second, in 2010 Murdoch University enacted a new raft of academic misconduct regulations and procedures including guidelines, frameworks, training for academic staff and instructional units for students, and a wider range of print and online resources focused on academic integrity. The aim of these initiatives is to demonstrate that Murdoch University not only has robust and transparent regulations, but also ensures fair, consistent, and most importantly a developmental approach toward promoting academic integrity.

## Background

Australian universities have been increasingly scrutinised in the media, and by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) on academic integrity. For example, the University of Newcastle's treatment of allegations of plagiarism by students in the University's Graduate School of Business drew considerable public attention to the issue of academic integrity in the Australian university sector. The University of New England (UNE), likewise, was brought into the media spotlight over an allegation of academic misconduct involving full-fee paying students in a Master of Information Technology course. In 2007, academic integrity issues were brought to the public's attention again when it was disclosed that in two universities in Queensland up to 2000 students had been proven to have committed plagiarism (Wenham, 2009). In a move to address the perception that academic misconduct was a major issue for Australian higher education, universities across the sector commenced a wide range of initiatives aimed at reducing the incidents of plagiarism and altering the perception that this was a systemic failing.

AUQA cycle two reports suggest universities across Australia have made significant moves towards stemming both the number of instances of academic misconduct, and the perception they are not focused on quality. For example, reporting on the University of Newcastle (Agency 2008, 27) the Panel raised the 2003 – 2005 plagiarism incident:

The Panel is aware of the widespread negative publicity that academic integrity issues, in particular plagiarism by students, caused between 2003 and 2005 culminating in a report and recommendations by the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

Following their investigation the Panel commended the University for its ‘widespread and consistent implementation of academic policies and procedures to control plagiarism’ (AUQA, 2008, p. 27 Commendation 10). In 2009, AUQA also affirmed the University of New England’s measures implemented to address plagiarism. For example, the Panel observed:

UNE has now put extensive plagiarism policies and procedures in place... Information on plagiarism is provided with every study unit. The Panel examined the records of plagiarism events and investigations for 2008 and noted that they appeared to have been handled satisfactorily, with appropriate penalties. (Agency 2009, 32)

Similarly, and more recently, the report on the University of Central Queensland (UCQ) noted it has moved to address issues of academic misconduct. The Panel observed, UCQ’s approach to academic misconduct is addressed in their *Student Misconduct and Plagiarism Policy* and the *Plagiarism Procedures* documents (Agency 2011, 25). A key facet of the UCQ approach related to the adoption of *Turnitin* as a means of addressing plagiarism. The University was affirmed for this, however the Panel observed:

The Panel believes that the recent decision by the Academic Board is a positive development. The Board mandated the use of text matching software, where appropriate, as an educational tool in preventing plagiarism and in assisting students to develop the necessary academic skills of scholarly research or to recognise examples of plagiarism. It will be important for the Academic Board to monitor consistently across the University the application of the software as a learning tool, to record instances of known plagiarism and impose appropriate penalties. The Panel encourages the University to consider further ways to mitigate the risks posed by plagiarism so that reasons for breaches of academic honesty are analysed and dealt with, including designing educational interventions and training staff in their use. (AUQA, 2011, p. 25)

While universities in Australia have moved in a positive direction towards addressing incidents of plagiarism, and to establish increasingly rigorous structures aimed at preventing systemic breakdowns in quality, student attitudes towards academic integrity remain a concern.

Plagiarism, as Leask (2006) observes, is a complex and, therefore much debated concept. What is less debated is the prevalence of this form of academic misconduct (Selwyn 2008). Illustrating the range of positions adopted in the *academy* to academic misconduct, in particular, plagiarism Leask (2006, p. 183) writes:

By some it is seen as a crime committed both wittingly and unwittingly by students across the world — a crime against which members of the academic community are currently waging a war consisting of many isolated battles, as well as more coordinated campaigns within and across universities and other educational institutions throughout the Western world. Others describe plagiarism as socially and culturally constructed action — an unconscious reaction to fundamental differences in values concerning the role of individuals in knowledge creation.

Critiquing the ‘discourse of plagiarism’ Leask (2006) drawing on Fairclough (1992) advances the notion that universities may be viewed, metaphorically as, engaging in a ‘war on plagiarism.’ Given the protracted nature of the conflict, both sides can be considered as having suffered casualties. Leask (2006, p. 184) argues, plagiarism is essentially a culturally bound power struggle between the *academy*, academic staff, students, and society encapsulated in the view it is, ‘We [who make] the rules... they have to follow our rules, or be punished for not doing so.’ Leask (2006, p. 190) argues, it is time to reconsider this type of metaphor, and offers the metaphor, ‘Old game – new rules’. But is this a ‘mixed up’ metaphor? Leask (2006) highlights the role academic staff and ‘good teaching’ potentially play in supporting students to

avoid academic misconduct. Given the attention to tightening processes in the examples cited above this facet of academic integrity may need further investment.

Selwyn (2008) observes academic cheating is now easier than ever since the advent of the Internet. Returning to the metaphor ‘Old game – new rules,’ one has to wonder about the degree to which the ‘new rules’ are influencing the ‘old game.’ There is a strong argument for the notion that if the rules change significantly enough then the game cannot be the same. In the British context, no less complex than the Australian, Selwyn (2008) explored the correlation between Internet usage and plagiarism. For example, Selwyn (2008, p. 466) observed that ‘for some researchers, student propensity to plagiarize is seen as being led directly by the structure and nature of the Internet itself.’ Selwyn’s findings suggest such claims are erroneous. However, Selwyn (2008, p. 476) reports:

Our data have found a majority of students reporting instances of copying non-attributed sentences and lines of material into their assignments, with around one-quarter of students doing so at the more substantial level of copying paragraphs of material... Yet, in making these observations, we should take care to maintain a balanced perspective and, most importantly, not allow the relative novelty of the internet to obscure the underlying issues behind these data. We have seen that whilst students (and academic commentators) may currently privilege online plagiarism as an especially prevalent activity, the actual reported levels of Internet-based plagiarism in our study were commensurate with the corresponding levels of ‘traditional’ paper-based plagiarism also reported by our respondents (see also McCabe 2005).

Furthermore, Selwyn’s (2008) data suggested a higher propensity towards a ‘looser approach to information gathering’ and non-attributed usage where students frequently engage in ‘informal procurement practices’ such as Internet piracy. However, Selwyn’s (2008, p. 476) major finding was ‘online plagiarism closely replicates and reinforces students’ general plagiarism’. Introducing another metaphor, Selwyn (2008) suggests the issue of online plagiarism may be nothing more than, ‘old wine in new bottles.’

In addressing the issue of plagiarism in an environment where ‘Internet piracy’ and ‘bit-torrenting’ are everyday practices for people globally, and where these practices are considered, ‘not necessarily a bad thing,’ (Selywn, 2008) it is incumbent upon universities to address the moral/ethical rather than the punitive domains. A point underscored by Selywn (2008, p. 476) who writes:

...online plagiarism is just one element of a wider ‘cheating culture’... we would conclude that university authorities would do well not to desist in their attempts to dissuade students from plagiarism in general... As ever, these efforts should be centered on working with students rather than against them – focusing not only on deterrence through detection and punishment (MacDonald and Carroll 2006) but on developing more holistic institutional approaches that emphasize a shared responsibility among the students, staff and institution.

In a similar vein to Leask (2006), Selwyn (2008) stresses academic misconduct needs to be approached holistically. Adopting a developmental approach to instilling the values of academic integrity, and exploring means of scaffolding students into the *academy* by moving them from the periphery of the community into its heart (Wenger, 1999) is not without its challenges. Given the moves to widen participation in the local context (Bradley, 2008), and increasing pressure on the Australian higher education sector to exploit the international student market (Marginson et al. 2010), approaches that adopt a development approach to academic integrity might inspire more ecological target sources for metaphors used to illustrate this issue.

Two universities in the Australian context of similar size and composition have responded to the increased challenge of maintaining flexible, robust, and relevant regulations, policies and procedures to address academic misconduct. Drawing on Dickens for inspiration (at least at the level of the title) the following now relates, *A tale of two cities*. First, the University of

Tasmania's Academic Integrity Project is reviewed and discussed. Second, Murdoch University redrafted its regulations, policies, and procedures to support natural justice and ensure a robust and transparent approach to issues of academic misconduct. Murdoch University focused on a developmental approach aimed at encouraging an ethic of academic integrity in the student population. These measures are outlined and discussed.

## The University of Tasmania Academic Integrity Project

### A brief history

The management of academic integrity and plagiarism issues within University of Tasmania underwent intensive review during 2001 in order to address common issues related to increasing incidences of student academic misconduct. The University of Tasmania review was intentionally a bottom up process in order to assess the impact of introducing new uses of existing technology to inform later strategic level decisions. During the period 2001-2004, the University of Tasmania established a Working Party to review its current framework and make recommendations as appropriate (Mulcahy & Goodacre, 2004). This Working Party also supported the introduction of an auditing mechanism in the form of text matching software, to assist in ensuring that the work submitted by students was indeed their own.

During 2005, a meeting of the University Teaching and Learning committee approved the use of the text-based pattern matching application *Turnitin*. The University Teaching & Learning Committee (UTLC) set a target of one unit or 10% of units per School, where appropriate, to use *Turnitin* each semester where:

- Individual Faculties would manage the use of *Turnitin*;
- Implementation would be the responsibility of the Heads of School;
- The Committee recommended that the use of *Turnitin* would be most appropriate for first year units in conjunction with additional assistance with developing student writing skills; and,
- The Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching (CALT) would provide central coordination of support for *Turnitin* and reporting of its use to Teaching & Learning Committee, Deans, A/Deans and Heads of Schools.

The uptake of *Turnitin* after the full rollout in early 2006 was slow. At other institutions where *Turnitin* use was at the discretion of individual academics, the uptake rate peaked at approximately 10% of academic staff. Use of *Turnitin* for both staff and students was also significantly simplified in 2006 with the successful introduction of the *Vista* learning management system plug-in for *Turnitin*. There was not a significant growth in *Turnitin* use as a result of the application's full rollout in 2006. Of the 91 staff who used *Turnitin* during 2006, up to 50% made use of the *Vista Turnitin* assignment tool. *Turnitin* appears to have been used on a unit basis in thirteen (13) schools. In an additional three (3) schools it appears to have been used initially as a punitive approach for documenting cases of suspected plagiarism.

*Turnitin*'s use during 2007 was almost 40% higher than in 2006, with this rise seeing a total of 129 teaching staff from 22 schools, through 81 units produce just fewer than 8,000 originality reports of students' papers. There continued to be an increasing proportion of use through the learning management system (LMS), now named *My Learning Online* (MyLO) (Mulcahy, 2007). One factor directly contributing to the increased uptake of *Turnitin* was the staff development sessions which were offered in Hobart and Launceston during 2007. These proved popular and as a result additional sessions were timetabled for Hobart. Several sessions were run, with 27 staff participating. The sessions covered issues associated with academic integrity in today's higher education context and how *Turnitin* can be used to support the management of academic integrity.

The provision for all students with access to a “*Turnitin* drop-box” was outlined in the *Turnitin* Usage Report, 2007. This was accepted by Academic Senate at its 13th June 2008 meeting (Mulcahy, 2007; Mulcahy, 2008). An information brochure on the new *Turnitin* service as well another brochure on Academic Integrity was produced and distributed during 2008. The brochure was sent to schools and service providers for distribution to staff and students. This brochure formed the first step in providing a wider range of promotional material to staff and students on *Turnitin*.

This educative universal access approach saw a dramatic increase in the use of the *Turnitin* service occur within the University during 2008, with the number of originality reports being produced jump to 18,594, and the number of units using the service increased to 154. Staff members using *Turnitin* also increased from 129 to 170. Staff development sessions continued to be popular with ten courses being offered and run during 2008, all of which were heavily subscribed. Customised sessions were run in-house for specific requesting schools, and a further two open subscription courses were offered via the web conferencing system *Eluminate*.

Early 2009 saw the release of the Usability Investigation – *Turnitin* and MyLO report from University Web Services, IT Resources. The focus groups were also attended by the CALT *Turnitin* administrators. From the responses to questions posed within all conducted focus groups, it became apparent that the current method of accessing the *Turnitin* drop-box was difficult, confusing to most and technologically challenging for others. The words and terms used did not have any great sense of connection for the students and several alternatives were offered by the focus groups. Based on the information revealed as a result of the focus groups the administrators decided that a more holistic student-centred approach be considered for 2009-10.

### **The Academic Writing Module**

A self-paced educative module was proposed by the author and support sought from the Co-Heads of CALT. Once approval had been obtained, a content framework was designed and based on material that was currently being offered through the University of Tasmania *UniStart* program. Input from the *UniStart* developers was sought and their comments integrated into the module content design along with an extensive section on how to use, understand and ultimately benefit from using the new module. Phrases and words that had more meaning to students were adopted along with the title which congealed based on the foundational concepts that the focus groups expressed as being more aligned with their beliefs about the resource.

July 2009 saw the release of the “Academic Writing Module”. This resource was created as a global artefact within the University of Tasmania LMS as a proactive measure focussing on informing students as well as University of Tasmania staff members as to the functionality of the *Turnitin* application, but this module was designed to go even further. The Academic Writing Module also provided accurate, easy to understand, up to date information on those concepts supporting academic integrity at University of Tasmania, as well as a host of visual examples, case studies and commentary on how to create, access, and most of all – how to understand the originality reports generated by the *Turnitin* application (Colbeck, 2009).

During 2009 the newly developed, released and promoted Academic Writing Module saw *Turnitin* usage escalate. This unprecedented usage appears to be correlated to a distinct mind shift emerging from the staff workshops where academics and students were now beginning to understand what *Turnitin* could actually be used for. Through the addition easy to understand support resources in the module, *Turnitin* was now beginning to be seen as a truly educative tool rather than simply a washing agent or a big brother style punitive disciplinary mechanism.

Staff interest in the new MyLO Academic Writing Module heightened with the number of engaged staff rising from 170 to 216 in just one semester. Student interest and interaction with

the new module also increased. Student focussed workshops were held for several requesting Faculties with appreciative feedback being received from both the students and staff members attending the sessions. The number of engaged staff and students rose to 23,237.

Document submission also rose, mainly by students but a number of staff were also using the application to check their own documents for correct punctuation and quote formatting. The number of submissions to the *Turnitin* application increased from 18,594 in 2008 to 23,325 2009. The Academic Writing Module was now recording more submissions than any of the other faculties individually. By the end of semester 1, 2010 (the 12 month anniversary of service of the Academic Writing Module), it became apparent that the module had overcome several shortfalls in the original release of the academic integrity project, and in particular, the uptake by staff and students of the *Turnitin* application.

The overall usage of the module had increased, with 16,290 submissions being received from 1st January up until 30th June 2010. Faculty use of the *Turnitin* application supporting draft reviews of assessment items appears to have declined in comparison to individual student use of the *Turnitin* application within the Academic Writing Module. However the number of assignment submissions through unit drop-boxes increased.

### **The user experience: Feedback forums**

A feedback forum was included within the module and contained the following topic threads:

- General questions and feedback (142 messages)
- Problems uploading documents to *Turnitin* (32 messages)
- Discussions about originality reports (11 messages)
- Your experiences using the Academic Writing Module (2 messages)

Through the moderation of these forums it was noticed that experienced users were becoming confident enough to answer queries from novice users. The peer advice given by these users was always carefully scrutinised by the administrators, with the need for correction of information offered rarely being needed. Complimentary and confirming advice was added where necessary and users seemed to enjoy this process of peer supported mentoring.

Some of the student feedback received on the total experience of using the module included:

Gotta tell ya....

This is the best thing since sliced bread! It's like your own personal proof reader.

Awesome :-)

Hi!!! In my opinion this is a wonderful constructive tool that will improve and easy our way of thinking when writing and vice versa.

Just want to say what a great idea for this module to be available to all students. Even though I am in my final semester, I can see what a benefit this module would have been in my initial stages of learning to write essays at uni. Well done.

Cool - I've been an academic for many years - plagiarism is no issue for me and "Turnitin" seems a cool idea for those who want it - no problems - guess it's just more "stuff" to deal with if we want it.

I think the whole thing's awesome. The level of support that University of Tasmania staff make available is really amazing. Any student only has to reach out to find any number of friendly individuals who will patiently work through their concerns with them, often in person. I also think it's really interesting culturally that we have to learn the 'system of learning' before we even get to our subjects of interest. The protocols, procedures, and social norms surrounding and supporting the institution of 'tertiary education' seem almost larger

than the institution itself. I expect this reflects both our global population and the resurgence of interest, among mature students, in self-education. Anyhoodle, having read through lots of comments, fantastic job Dr. Colbeck.

By allowing the students to comment on and respond to each other, an acceptance of this particular text matching application as an educative tool was gaining support.

The University of Tasmania uses many approaches to help manage academic integrity. Foremost is the provision of services to students to help them prepare correctly cited and referenced work. Teaching staff expertise and knowledge of the literature within their discipline is also an important asset in managing academic integrity. The Academic Integrity Project (incorporating *Turnitin*) developed by University of Tasmania is one such strategy available to both students and staff, to assist with the development of academic literacy skills and the promotion of academic integrity.

From the usage statistics presented in this paper it can clearly be seen that the *Turnitin* application is being used by an increasing number of University of Tasmania staff and that the Academic Writing Module is also being used by a similarly increasing number of students (+25-30% per annum). From discussions with University of Tasmania staff members, it has become fairly evident that while a proportion of staff use the *Turnitin* application to supply evidence related to instances of suspected plagiarism, far more are using the application and the module to support their teaching activities by informing and promoting students' understanding of academic integrity.

With an increasing student population, the incidences of proven intentional plagiarism appear to be constant, however the incidences of reported unintentional plagiarism appear to be falling. While there is no definite correlation, the author is convinced that this may well be due to the heightened awareness of staff and students as to each of their responsibilities regarding academic integrity. Since the introduction of the *Turnitin* application in 2007, and the Academic Writing Module in 2009, the percentage of student population proven to have committed some form of academic misconduct has dropped from 1.94% (2006) to 1.12% (2010).

Having now reviewed the University of Tasmania's moves to promote academic integrity through the introduction and roll-out of *Turnitin*, staff and student development programs, the following considers Murdoch University's attempts to secure a robust and transparent approach to academic integrity and the development of the 'ethical student'.

## **Murdoch University Academic Misconduct Review**

In the 2006 *Report of an audit of Murdoch University* (AQUA, 2006, p. 28) quality assurance processes employed by Murdoch University, to ensure academic integrity, were considered by the Panel to be 'well covered'. However, in February of 2007 Murdoch University received a letter from the Ombudsman's Office representing a student alleging the University had acted unreasonably by imposing penalties on him for academic misconduct, and that the disciplinary and appeals processes used by the University were 'flawed'. In arriving at a finding the Ombudsman's Office raised issues of procedural unfairness and encouraged the University to examine how the processes for managing cases of academic misconduct could be improved. While this case did not draw the gaze of the media it did evoke a significant shift in how Murdoch would approach academic misconduct. In response, Murdoch University's Academic Council (the principal decision making body for academic issues) resolved in January 2008 to establish a Working Party to review the *Misconduct and Student Discipline Statute*.

The Terms of Reference for the working Party included:

1. Review the general scope of misconduct at Murdoch university and propose amendments to the Student Discipline Statute. Proposed amendments must take into consideration:

- a. Murdoch University's assessment policy;
  - b. Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007);
  - c. Code of Ethics and Student Code of Conduct;
  - d. Any relevant Legislation; and
  - e. Other relevant documents
2. Review and suggest amendments as necessary to relevant existing documentation such as the Student Charter to ensure consistency.

In August 2010 the Working Party presented to Academic Council new Student Discipline Regulations and then in November 2010 the Procedures. This included a framework to determine the degree of academic misconduct, a communication and procedures flowchart, guidelines to determine penalties and correspondence templates. As a consequence of the new *Regulations and Procedures* new offices were created in the faculties. Under the new procedures Unit Coordinators suspecting students of academic misconduct, would refer the case to staff members appointed and trained to act as 'investigators'. They in turn would then refer the case to appointed 'arbiters' who would determine, based on the evidence, what penalty, if any, would be applied. The following based on Minutes from the Working Party elaborates some of the deliberations of the Working Party to highlight the priority placed on adopting a developmental approach to scaffold students into Murdoch University as a 'community of practice' (Wenger, 1999). This is followed by an overview of initiatives taken across the University to engage students and staff with academic integrity and the new *Regulations and Procedures* to ensure consistency, transparency and natural justice.

In February 2008, the *Review of Misconduct and Student Disciplinary Statute Working Party* meeting convened with a Student Guild representative as a permanent member. It was the view of the Working Party that student input was most welcomed. It was noted that references to 'natural justice' were not present in the existing *Student Disciplinary Statute*. It was argued, this facet 'should be made explicit'. Moreover, it was observed there needed to be a broadening in understanding about the nature and types of academic misconduct. The Working Party determined they first needed to establish a framework built on explicating and foregrounding the place of values in Murdoch University's approach to academic integrity. It was noted in the minutes:

Values should be established, followed by processes so that all stakeholders understood the values.

In the following Working Party, issues related to the concept of 'natural justice' were debated and a review of other institutions understanding of and approaches to misconduct was undertaken 'as a beneficial way of determining Murdoch's future model' (05/04/04 Minutes). Drawing on the *Australian Code of Practice for the Responsible Conduct of Research*, the members of the Working Party stressed the need to place 'an educative process', in other words, a developmental approach to academic misconduct. The Working Party at its next meeting commenced redrafting the *Misconduct and Student Disciplinary Statute* and determined academic misconduct and general misconduct ought to be segregated and the *Statute* repealed and replaced by a comprehensive set of *Regulations*. In order to achieve this University required an act of Parliament and commenced negotiations with the Minister for Education's Office. At the third meeting in March (2008) academic integrity was also debated with a focus on the practices and processes employed at that time. The Working Party determined academic integrity would be:

... split into 'education' and 'misconduct'. In the event of academic misconduct considered to be relatively minor, such as not referencing every quote, students would dealt with via education. They would have reinforced for them what they have done wrong and the importance of academic integrity. They would also be required to complete some type of compulsory education to ensure they do not re-offend. Records would need to be kept so that repeat offences can be identities. If a student is a repeat offender or is charged with a

more serious misconduct allegation this would be dealt with as misconduct. (19/04/08, Minutes)

As the work of the Working Party progressed the role of academic staff across all levels were highlighted and the need to develop their capabilities around academic integrity identified as a priority. The Working Party also discussed the nature of information to be provided to students and the form that information ought to take. While Murdoch University has generic information about academic integrity in all of its Unit Information and Learning Guides, in the Handbook and on its website, etc, it was the view of the Working Party that as the Statute was being replaced with new regulations, procedures and guidelines this represented a ideal opportunity to revitalise and embed this information in other ways.

Moving forward to 2009, as the new *Regulations and Procedures* were well advanced and had been circulated to key stakeholders across the University for feedback, the issue of staff development was again brought to the fore. Under the new procedures, as noted above, each Faculty would have an investigator, arbiters and Faculty Support Officers performing allocated functions. In addition to providing training specific to each role and how the processes would function, emphasis was placed on ensuring due consideration is given to the students' level of academic experience and prior history when determining allegations of academic misconduct. The Working Party believed this would ensure consistency across all Schools, in regards to robustness and transparency. At the end of 2009, the Working Party had complete the draft of the *Student Discipline Guidelines* comprising a framework to determine the degree of academic misconduct, a communication and process flowchart, and a guideline for determining possible penalties.

Key elements in the framework to determine the degree of academic misconduct included the form and extent of academic misconduct, the student's level of experience and previous offences and 'mitigating circumstances and/or likely causes and intent of academic misconduct'. In arriving at a determination there are four possible levels; Minor (no investigation warranted), student directed to complete the Academic Integrity Learning Task, Academic Misconduct Levels one through three. If the level of academic misconduct is determined to be Level 1 the allegation is escalated to the Faculty investigator. If upon investigation it is determined the allegation is supported and constitutes misconduct at level one the investigator can determine the penalty. If the misconduct constitutes a level two, or three, then it is escalated to an arbiter who deliberates, and then determines the penalty if the allegation is upheld. At key stages in the process the student has the right of reply and where penalties are determined, and the right of appeal in accordance with University policies.

*Turnitin* has been available to Unit Coordinators and students since 2007/2008. Its uptake by Unit Coordinators has not been overly enthusiastic. However, Unit Coordinators are strongly encouraged to make it available in all of their units. In October 2010, the consensus in the Working Party was 'both staff and students experienced difficulty using *Turnitin* and it should not be included in the *Student Discipline Procedure*.' However, it was the view of the Working Party that training be provided to investigators, arbiters and academic staff concerning *Turnitin*. Training programs have been rolled out and will be further expanded. Resources on using *Turnitin* have been made available to students through the Murdoch University Library, and the Student Learning Centre in both online and face to face teaching modes.

As an outcome of the deliberations of the Working Party it was determined that the Student Learning Centre (SLC) would play a more central role in support students in the development of academic integrity. In addition to offering regular workshops, attending guest lectures and working with students individually, the SLC would develop a project (currently ongoing), including resources and materials for staff and students. Furthermore, they are also designing a compulsory zero-credit-point introductory academic integrity unit for all students (irrespective of year or degree) to complete prior to the completion of their first semester, an initiative similar

to that implemented by the University of Western Australia (Academic Conduct Essentials, <http://www.ace.uwa.edu.au/>).

All students entering Murdoch in their first year are required to take an interdisciplinary Foundation Unit. In these units students are scaffolded into their disciplinary community of practice and the university community. The focus of these units is building students' academic literacies. Attention is paid to academic integrity conceptually, ethically and practically. In these units students are introduced to the values and academic expectations of Murdoch, and how to apply conventions, such as, the APA and Chicago styles. All (including adjunct) tutors and Unit Coordinators as part of their 'capability building' are required to attend annual professional development programs where academic integrity is featured including the new *Regulations and Procedures*, *Turnitin*, and how to promote academic integrity through pedagogy.

The Working Party will convene in the latter half of 2011 to obtain feedback on how the implementation process is working. Murdoch University has moved to ensure, through the work of the Working Party, that its regulations and processes are robust, grounded in notions of natural justice, and transparent. Moreover, a constant theme throughout the process of drafting now *Regulations and Procedures* has been the development of academic staff and scaffolding students into the Murdoch academic community.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, both universities have adopted quite different approaches to academic integrity; the University of Tasmania building on a program to embed *Turnitin* into its educative processes, and Murdoch University through a review of its Misconduct Statute. In both cases it has been argued the underlying value, consistent with the earlier observations of Leask (2006) and Selywen (2008), has been the emphasis placed on adopting a developmental approach to academic integrity to foster the ethical student. Committing academic misconduct is now easier than in the past, and the pressure on students to perform for pragmatic, cultural and/or social reasons are, arguably, stronger than ever.

A developmental approach to academic integrity encompasses both students and academic staff. For students, it is aimed at making explicit the values of the *academy* within the specific institutional context and supporting them in the development of the skills they need to participate as full citizens in the academic community. For staff, it is supporting them in the use of technologies such as *Turnitin*, but also ensuring they are adequately informed about how to assess academic misconduct, understand their role and the processes for managing academic misconduct when it occurs. Returning to the observations of the Panel (2011, UCQ) it appears that designing educational interventions and providing staff development opportunities are equally important, if not more so, than pursuing academic integrity through technology and policy alone. In engaging with the metaphor *academic integrity is a war*, we might do well to consider the idiom, '*wars are not won on the battlefield. They're won in the minds and hearts of the people*'. Rather than drawing on metaphors such as '*old game, new rules*', perhaps fables can provide inspiration for innovative ways to consider how best to address the complexities of academic integrity.

### *The two pots (an Aesop's fable)*

*A river carried down in its stream two Pots, one made of earthenware and the other of brass. The Earthen Pot said to the Brass Pot, "Pray keep your distance and do not come near me, for if you touch me ever so slightly, I shall be broken in pieces, and besides, I by no means wish to come near you."*

## References

- Australian Universities Quality Agency (2011). Report of an audit of Central Queensland University. Melbourne. [verified 5 Sep 2011] [http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport\\_cqu\\_2011.pdf](http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_cqu_2011.pdf)
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (2006). Report of an audit of Murdoch University. Melbourne. [verified 5 Sep 2011] [http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport\\_murdoch\\_2006.pdf](http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_murdoch_2006.pdf)
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (2009). Report of an audit of The University of New England. Melbourne [verified 5 Sep 2011]. [http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport\\_une\\_2009.pdf](http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_une_2009.pdf)
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (2008). Report of an audit of the University of Newcastle. Melbourne. [verified 5 Sep 2011] [http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport\\_newcastle\\_2008.pdf](http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_newcastle_2008.pdf)
- Bradley, D. (Chair) (2008). *Review of Australian Higher Education Report*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. <http://www.deewr.gov.au/highereducation/review/pages/reviewofaustralianhighereducationreport.aspx>
- Colbeck, D. (2009). Academic Integrity Report. Launceston, University of Tasmania.
- Colbeck, D. (2010). Academic Integrity Report. Launceston, University of Tasmania.
- Davis, B. (1993). Preventing academic dishonesty. University of California, Berkeley. [viewed 30 Nov 2002, verified 5 Sep 2011] <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/bgd/prevent.html>
- Mulchay, S. (2006). Turnitin Usage Report. Hobart, University of Tasmania.
- Mulchay, S. (2007). Turnitin Usage Report. Hobart, University of Tasmania.
- Mulchay, S (2008). Turnitin Usage Report. Hobart, University of Tasmania.
- Mulcahy, S. & Goodacre, C. (2004). Opening Pandora's box of academic integrity: Using plagiarism detection software. In *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings ASCILITE Perth 2004*. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/mulcahy.html>
- Selwyn, N. (2008). "Not necessarily a bad thing...": A study of online plagiarism amongst undergraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 465-479. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602930701563104>
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenham, M. (2009). Checks catch thousands of uni students cheating. The Courier-Mail, 23 November. [viewed 22 May 2011, verified 5 Sep 2011] <http://www.adelaidenow.com.au/news/national/checks-catch-thousands-of-uni-students-cheating/story-e6frea8c-1225801907376>

Whitsed, C. & Colbeck, D. (2011). A tale of two cities: Implementing a developmental approach to academic integrity in two Australian universities. In *Educational integrity: Culture and values. Proceedings 5th Asia Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity*. The University of Western Australia, 26-28 September. (pp. 127-137) <http://www.apcei.catl.uwa.edu.au/procs/whitsed.pdf>