

Brief Update from the Academic Integrity Rubric Project Group for the Deans' Meeting October 2018

The history of the project

- The DVCA requested that Deans ensure that the Academic Integrity Rubric be embedded in 'First Year Foundation Courses' in Semester 1, 2018
- The request reflected the need for an institutional approach to ensuring that students have a strong understanding and practice of academic integrity
- The Rubric replaced the 'Academic Integrity Module' which was piloted in Semester 1, 2017. While the module is a good resource it did not provide an embedded approach which meant that there was some disconnect between students' completion of the module and applying academic integrity skills
- The embedding of the Rubric was overseen by a project group (LTO, Study Centres, Library), however there is no current 'owner' of the oversight of academic integrity

Implementation of the AI Rubric

- It is not clear how many Schools used the Rubric in 2018
- Data regarding the implementation of the Rubric was collected from students via a survey at the end of Semester 1, 2018 and via a survey and focus group of academics
- Approximate response rates
 - Survey of academics 60% (N=15)
 - Focus group of academics 27% (only Sydney academics volunteered to participate)
 - Survey of students (n=194) (most student responses were from the Sydney School of Nursing where the survey was conducted in class). At this stage we have not been able to determine how many students were sent the survey.
- The data suggests the following:
 - Student perceptions of the experience of using the Rubric was positive
 - Students reported that they understood AI as a result of the Rubric and it was highly valued
 - Academics in general found the Rubric helpful and were in support of its use
 - Academics used a number of strategies to embed the rubric:
 - As part of all assessment task rubrics for the foundation course
 - As part of a rubric; one criteria from the Rubric per assessment task
 - As a hurdle for one assessment task
 - Academics used a number of strategies to address student work determined as 'not yet'
 - One-to-one, face-to-face meetings
 - Drop in sessions
 - Referred to Study Centre immediately
 - Referred to Study Centre where consistently 'not yet'
 - Academics had a number of concerns
 - The implication of 'hold grades' on Schools Regulations
 - Lack of clarity re what to do when student work was determined as 'not yet'
 - Volume of work in managing 'not yet'
 - Tracking of student performance
 - Academics agreed that the criteria regarding paraphrasing needed revising to ensure that it identifies that while students are using their own words, the content must be accurate.

Recommendations from the project group re the use of the Rubric in 2019

- 1.** Notre Dame needs an institutional mechanism regarding the monitoring of academic integrity to meet the HESF, and as such the use of an institutional Academic Integrity Rubric be maintained
- 2.** Oversight of academic integrity be in line with learning and teaching governance structures
- 3.** Clear procedures for monitoring and reporting of academic integrity be developed
- 4.** Clearer guidelines for managing 'not yet' be developed
- 5.** All Schools use the Rubric, but Schools should be given control regarding how to implement it
- 6.** Exemplars regarding how Schools are embedding the Rubric be gathered and shared
- 7.** In keeping with the Objects academic integrity be taught from an ethics perspective
- 8.** Academics understand that they have a role in teaching and monitoring academic integrity
- 9.** Academics be provided with resources to support their knowledge and skills in teaching academic integrity
- 10.** The criteria for paraphrasing be revised (see below)
- 11.** Deans provide the project group with the name of the first year coordinator/leader in their School

Arising from the consultation with the Deans

The Deans were in support of the recommendations agreeing that further developments be channelled through the Learning and Teaching Committee.

		UNSATISFACTORY		SATISFACTORY	
Academic Integrity Rubric	Criteria	Not yet	Developing	Achieved	
Generic	Paraphrasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paraphrasing mirrors significant amounts of the original. Student has not yet 'repackaged' the ideas in their own words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student has mostly used their own words to convey correct meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student has used their own words to convey correct meaning 	
	Reference List/Bibliography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reference list/bibliography is not present or is present but does not list two or more citations used in-text. A reference list/bibliography is present but formatting does not comply with the referencing style and/or lacks significant information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reference list/bibliography is present, however, there may be missing/incorrect components, such as capitals/italics, abbreviations, author/headings not alphabetised and/or missing references used in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference list/bibliography is correct. Electronic resource identifiers are consistently used (DOIs - Digital Object Identifiers and/or URLs - Universal Resource Locators) 	
School Citations	APA In-Text Citations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-text citations are absent. In-text citations are present but are infrequent, and sources of information or data are not acknowledged. Quotes are used but not identified as quotes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of in-text citations are limited. Components of in-text citations are missing or incorrect such as author/year. Where quotes are used, they are identified as quotes, however, components are missing or incorrect, such as page number. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-text citations are present and sources of information or data are acknowledged. Components of in-text citations are correct. Where quotes are used, they are identified as quotes. 	
	AGLC Footnotes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations and footnotes are limited and/or absent. Components of limited citations and footnotes are incorrect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations are limited. Components of citations and footnotes are missing or incorrect such as: position of footnote numbers, punctuation errors, pinpoint references, introductory signals for citation, sources referring to other sources, subsequent referencing, quotation errors and domestic and secondary source errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footnoting format is used correctly where sources are noted in text using a superscript (raised) number that corresponds to a footnote at the bottom of the page (foot) where the citation is written. The most specific rule for a source is used or adaptation of closest fitting rule where a source is not included in AGLC. References and quotations are cited in accordance with AGLC with pinpoint references provided. Components of citations and footnotes are correct. 	
	Chicago Footnotes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footnotes are limited and/or absent, or only contain contextual notes. Components of limited citations and footnotes are mostly incorrect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations are limited. Components of citations and footnotes are missing or incorrect such as: superscript number not correctly used in text for footnotes, publication information, page reference, punctuation errors and short form citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footnoting format is used correctly where sources are noted in text using a superscript (raised) number that corresponds to a footnote at the bottom of the page (foot) where the citation is written. First full footnote citation correct and second and subsequent short footnote citations are correct. 	