

Engaging in Integrity: A Case Study on Leveraging the LMS for Faculty Education

Angela Clark^{*1,3}, Laura Facciolo², and Iryna Pavlova³

Abstract

Expedited by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the learning management system (LMS) has become a fixture in the infrastructure of the post-secondary classroom. This paper presents a case study describing the actions of a centralized Academic Integrity Office (AIO) at a Canadian community college that aimed to promote faculty engagement and support academic integrity education through the LMS. Specifically, we narrate the development and evolution of an LMS-based repository, examining its impacts and offering recommendations for enhancing social learning and community building. Over time, this repository was transformed into a more robust, centralized portal that improved access to academic integrity resources. Viewership increased to approximately 100 daily visitors, highlighting how platform selection influences access, which in turn supports faculty engagement and participation. This work seeks to address a gap in practice and scholarship by exploring how LMS functionalities and institutional portals can be leveraged to foster communication, build community engagement, and support the development of faculty and student academic integrity literacy while also strengthening faculty-practitioner partnerships.

Keywords

academic integrity, academic misconduct, Canada, faculty engagement, learning management system

¹York University ²Humber Polytechnic ³Sheridan College

*Corresponding author: angclark@yorku.ca

Introduction

As emergency remote teaching (ERT) emerged as a necessary pedagogical response to the COVID-19 pandemic, academic integrity became a central concern in post-secondary education. The transition from in-person instruction to the online environment brought new challenges for educators and students alike. Specifically, research suggests that the onset of ERT coincided with a spike in academic misconduct rates across the post-secondary sector, with frequent reports of cheating on exams, quizzes, homework, projects, and papers (Chibry & Kurz, 2022; Gamage et al., 2020; Jenkins et al., 2022). For example, Jenkins et al. (2022) found that nearly 75% of students in their study self-reported engaging in academic misconduct during the pandemic, and 46% reported cheating for the first time. The authors attribute this rise, in part, to the challenge of enforcing academic standards in remote learning environments and to reduced access to the academic support services previously available to students.

To help address the evolving problem of academic misconduct, an increasing number of institutions have adopted strategies that prioritize prevention through education and advocacy. A range of educational interventions have been implemented, such as ambassador models, outreach campaigns, and e-learning modules; however, their effectiveness in curtailing misconduct is relatively unknown (Richards et al., 2016;

Saddiqui, 2016; Sefcik et al., 2020; Stoesz & Yuditseva, 2018). Recently, there has been a growing recognition of the need to prioritize faculty education to complement these predominantly student-focused interventions; to that end, higher education institutions are increasingly implementing faculty-focused initiatives, including workshops, webinars, speaker sessions, and training programs (Chugh et al., 2021). However, as Pethrick (2020) points out, students continue to be positioned as the primary audience of academic integrity programming, which “could imply that academic integrity is a student-only issue” (p. 13).

This article describes a project undertaken at one Canadian college to leverage the learning management system (LMS) as an intervention mechanism at the faculty level to create consistency in academic integrity messaging, empower faculty through education and training, and advance faculty-practitioner partnerships. Using a case study approach, we describe the development of the “Academic Integrity Space” through various stages: initial conceptualization, intervention planning and development, launch, and subsequent restructuring. Lastly, we present some recommendations for those considering undertaking similar projects.

Literature Review

Across higher education, faculty play a central role in upholding academic integrity, often assuming responsibility for promoting ethical academic practices, preventing academic misconduct, detecting and reporting breaches, and in some institutional contexts, imposing a sanction. While the literature suggests that most faculty members feel a strong sense of responsibility to maintain academic integrity in their learning environments, their ability to act on this responsibility can be constrained by a lack of time, unclear policies, and insufficient institutional support (Bertram Gallant, 2018; Coalter et al., 2007; MacLeod & Eaton, 2020; Thomas & De Bruin, 2012). Additionally, instructors may hold differing philosophies and understandings of academic integrity, resulting in inconsistencies in how it is communicated and addressed (Amigud & Pell, 2021; de Maio et al., 2020). For instance, Pincus & Schmelkin (2003) found that faculty members lack consensus on which behaviours constitute academic misconduct, contributing to variations in messaging, detection, and reporting. Even when institutional policies attempt to define these behaviours, their complexities tend not to be captured, which can further complicate efforts to promote a shared understanding among faculty (de Maio et al., 2020; MacLeod & Eaton, 2020; Thomas & De Bruin, 2012). Additionally, Brimble (2016) notes that faculty are experiencing escalating pressure due to heavy workloads, rising research and teaching expectations, larger class sizes, and limited resources. Further, research indicates that instructional support for faculty efforts to promote academic integrity in the classroom appears to be lacking (Gottardello & Karabag, 2022; Löfström et al., 2015; Stoesz et al., 2020). As a consequence, it is not surprising that faculty members find it difficult “to create/select meaningful learning activities that stress the importance of acting with integrity and are aligned with specific learning objectives, are pedagogically sound, and are transferable and lasting” (Stoesz & Yuditseva, 2018, p. 15). Given the critical role of faculty in promoting and upholding academic integrity, it is concerning that they receive insufficient support, have limited access to professional development opportunities, and lack scholarly research on the topic to guide their practice (Brimble, 2016; Coren, 2011; Hamilton & Wolsky, 2022; Morris & Carroll, 2016; Saddiqui, 2016; Zivcakova et al., 2012).

Attempts have been made to advocate for a more holistic approach to academic integrity education that extends beyond the student to rectify some of these gaps (Miron et al., 2021; Sefcik et al., 2020; Striepe et al., 2021). Holistic models, exemplified by the International Center for Academic Integrity’s (ICAI) (2022) Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS), tend to encompass some of the following components: administrative leadership and support; faculty engagement and support; staff engagement and support; student engagement and support; education and communication; policies and procedures, and research and evaluation. Adopting a holistic approach to education can strengthen the messaging that aca-

ademic integrity is a shared responsibility across the academic community, leading to a more unified approach (Miron et al., 2021). However, as Morris & Carroll (2016) point out, “a framework cannot in itself achieve these goals – those implementing it need to be engaged and well resourced” (p. 450).

While frameworks such as the AIRS offer structured approaches, their success depends on factors such as institutional commitment, faculty engagement, and adequate resources, which all remain inconsistent across institutions (Morris & Carroll, 2016). Faculty play a key role in upholding academic integrity, yet they often face constraints such as a lack of time, training, support, and guidance (Brimble, 2016; Coren, 2011; Hamilton & Wolsky, 2022; Saddiqui, 2016). Recognizing these barriers, this study explored practical solutions within existing institutional systems. Consequently, the guiding research question for this study was as follows: How might an LMS be leveraged as an intervention to address gaps in faculty support for academic integrity education?

Method

To address the lack of faculty support and engagement related to academic integrity reported in the literature, this paper describes the development of a centralized repository of academic integrity resources at one Canadian college. Designed to reflect a holistic approach to academic integrity education, the resources included in this repository vary in modality and purpose. Some are instructional in nature, designed to be implemented into diverse course curricula across disciplines; others offer faculty guidance on detecting potential breaches and responding to violations in ways that consider extenuating student circumstances. The overall aim of building this repository was to provide educators across the College with diverse supports to raise awareness of academic integrity expectations at the student level and to promote consistent messaging, behaviours, and values at the faculty level.

Using a case study method, we narrate the evolution of a repository designed to provide faculty members with direct access to academic integrity-related resources. As academic integrity practitioners and researchers, our levels of involvement varied due to staffing changes; one author joined the project midway and continues to lead the repository’s ongoing and iterative development. We use reflective writing practice to describe our needs analysis, planning, design, implementation, and evaluation, with particular attention to the challenges encountered throughout the process.

Background: Academic Integrity at the College

The idea for this intervention emerged largely in response to faculty demand: educators across the College regularly contacted the institution’s centralized Academic Integrity Office (AIO) for advice on suspected breaches and requested resources to support prevention efforts. Faculty members were

clearly invested in academic integrity; however, as is common across the academic integrity field, our existing materials and supports were primarily geared towards promoting student understanding rather than engaging faculty (Bretag et al., 2011; Saddiqui, 2016). For example, in 2017, the College launched an e-learning tutorial for students to help raise awareness and prevent misconduct.

Academic integrity tutorials (or modules) are a commonly used intervention in higher education and have been shown to improve student knowledge and attitudes towards ethical academic practices. Stoesz & Yuditseva (2018) found that these modules can support the understanding of plagiarism and enhance students' knowledge and attitudes about academic integrity. Stephens et al. (2021) and Henslee et al. (2017) reported similar short-term gains; however, both studies also noted the modules' limited long-term impact. The literature also raises concerns that these modules are often treated as compliance exercises rather than meaningful learning opportunities connected to course content (Stephens et al., 2021; Reinke et al., 2024). Sefcik et al. (2020) highlight low student engagement, and East (2016) emphasizes the need for deeper, more reflective learning that goes beyond procedural instruction. While useful, academic integrity modules are more effective when integrated into discipline-specific teaching and supported by broader institutional strategies (Stephens et al., 2021).

During the Fall 2019 term, the e-learning tutorial became mandated across the College. The AIO, in collaboration with the College's librarians, developed a strategy where every incoming student would encounter the tutorial and complete a related assessment at least once within their first semester. Following this implementation, reported breaches of academic integrity decreased by approximately 20% (per the College's internal breach data). While this presents a positive impact, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the tutorial alone contributed to this decline, given the potential influence of other factors. However, as the research suggests, embedding academic integrity modules within courses can enhance academic integrity's relevance and impact as it is aligned with students' disciplinary contexts. This highlights the importance of faculty involvement in academic integrity efforts and the need to support educators with the pedagogical tools to integrate academic integrity purposefully into their teaching.

The College also offered other initiatives, such as a student Academic Integrity Ambassador program, drop-in peer support, and an academic integrity remediation program. Yet, concern amongst faculty members persisted, particularly as somewhat novel forms of academic misconduct emerged or were exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the unauthorized use of group messaging apps and "homework help" websites. While the College hosted faculty workshops and consultation sessions, confusion persisted. Similarly, Löfström et al. (2015) report that faculty often lack clarity about *who* who should be teaching academic integrity,

what should be taught, and *how* academic integrity should be integrated into the curricula. Accordingly, we developed the Academic Integrity Space, an open repository of targeted resources, to rapidly deliver ongoing, responsive resources to faculty members across the College.

Phase 1: Designing the Space

Development of the "Academic Integrity Space" (hereafter, "the Space") began during the 2021 Spring/Summer term. Designed as a consolidated collection of resources, we wanted the Space to support all faculty members and academic managers in delivering clear and consistent academic integrity messaging. To ensure accessibility, we chose to host the Space via the institutional LMS, Desire2Learn (D2L), a platform regularly used and highly visible to educators. D2L also provides functionality that allows educators to easily copy components, such as instructional resources, into their own courses in D2L. In its initial iteration, the Space was structured according to two priority areas: 1) navigating suspected breaches of academic integrity; and 2) instructional support (see Table 1).

Navigating Suspected Academic Integrity Breaches

The College's Academic Integrity Policy allows faculty members to manage first-time academic integrity violations independently. This includes investigating the incident, determining whether it constitutes a breach, assessing its severity, formally reporting it, and, depending on the circumstances, assigning a suitable sanction. At any of these stages, faculty may elect to involve an academic integrity practitioner for support and guidance. For instance, during the investigation phase, the practitioner can act as a mediator, facilitating meetings between faculty and students to help ensure procedural consistency, promote fairness, and support a more educational and balanced dialogue between students and faculty members. Lynch et al. (2021) point out that faculty members often feel "inadequately prepared" to detect and investigate behaviours of academic misconduct (p. 12). Similarly, MacLeod & Eaton (2020) note that faculty members frequently do "not concern themselves with the policy until triggered by an external stimulus—most commonly an encounter with student academic misconduct" (p. 354). These findings align with our own experiences supporting breach investigations, which revealed a need to provide faculty with additional support in interpreting and applying formal institutional policies.

Instructional Support

This second priority area emerged from examining our centralized data on reported breaches to learn which breaches occurred most often within the institution so we could target our instructional support effectively. Our analysis determined that plagiarism was the most reported breach, followed by cheating. This finding may not be surprising to academic integrity practitioners and researchers, given that plagiarism (intentional or unintentional) is often the most common form

Table 1. “Academic Integrity Space” Organizational Structure (Phase 1)

Section: Resources for Students – Raising Awareness
Sub-Section: Lessons, Activities, and Assessments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start of Term Reminder • Online Game: Learning about Academic Integrity • Class Presentation: Academic Integrity • Pre/Post Discussion: Academic Integrity Tutorial • Reflective Questions: Academic Integrity Tutorial • Assignments: Email to Professor, Ethical Lapses in the Workplace, Examining Plagiarism
Subsection: Assignment Checklists
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment Checklist • Prewriting Checklist • Group Work Checklist • Peer Review Checklist
Subsection: Assessment Reminders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template: Assignment Reminders
Section: Resources for Faculty – Preventing and Responding to Breaches
Sub-Section: Proactive Pedagogical Approaches to Academic Integrity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAQ: A Faculty Guide to Homework Help sites
Subsection: Suspected Breach? Guidelines for Next Steps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infographics: Plagiarism or Teachable Moment?; Reporting a Breach • Reporting Form: Breach of Academic Integrity • Email Templates: Suspected Breach; Remediation Request
Subsection: Meeting with a Student about a Suspected Breach?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video: General Guidelines for Meeting with a Student

of academic dishonesty (Marques et al., 2019; Olafson et al., 2014). We also drew on internal qualitative data, collected through our formal reporting process, which includes a breach form, where faculty members indicate their rationale for reporting the breach and students can provide commentary. These student responses provided particularly valuable insights. In most cases, students denied responsibility or wrongdoing, presumably hoping the case would be dismissed and no penalty would be imposed. However, some students were more forthcoming, admitting to misconduct and offering explanations for their actions. Analysis of these comments revealed three main contributing factors: poor time management, lack of understanding of the assessment instructions, and lack of understanding of the College’s academic integrity expectations. These insights informed the development of

subsequent resources.

Once the Space’s first iteration was complete, we developed a strategic dissemination plan. Instructors already using the e-learning tutorial were sent an email that invited them to enrol; academic managers were also contacted to promote the Space within their Faculties. We also collaborated with the College’s communications team to promote the repository through additional channels, such as the institution’s faculty newsletter. By Fall 2021, 375 faculty members had been enrolled into the Space. However, challenges with hosting this repository on the institutional LMS immediately became apparent. Enrolling faculty members into the Space was a manual and time-consuming process, and while we had hoped the LMS’s infrastructure would motivate interaction, knowledge sharing, and cross-campus collaboration, faculty did not appear to be using the Space this way.

Phase 2: Responding and Refining

During the initial planning phase, we relied on two data streams: 1) our insight from assisting faculty with academic misconduct cases, and 2) data collected from breach reports. These helped shape the Space’s infrastructure. However, recognizing that “so many [academic] transgressions go unreported” (Crossman, 2019, p. 33), we saw the need for an ongoing needs assessment to gain a more complete picture of what academic integrity looked like across the institution beyond formally reported cases. To support this work, the AIO developed an internal database on Microsoft SharePoint to systematically document all incoming inquiries.

Adding an Additional Knowledge Base

Using Microsoft SharePoint allowed us to collect data, ranging from the most requested classroom presentation topics to the academic integrity policy sections frequently identified as ambiguous (most notably plagiarism). Additional data points included requests for investigation support, sanctioning guidance, remediation information, general advice on avoiding academic misconduct, and ad hoc requests from external and internal stakeholders. These insights helped us identify recurring support needs, which in turn helped us better tailor our offerings. More importantly, the data helped us recognize the affective undertones of a culture of integrity that was emerging: (a) one that was explicitly reactive, particularly during the pandemic, and (b) the corresponding period of educational disruption, emergency, and uncertainty. We made it a priority to proactively respond to this emerging emotional culture during this refinement period, focusing on two areas of interest that had emerged from our analysis of all requests and inquiries to the AIO: improving academic integrity messaging, and supporting the “emotionally rich” experience of responding to academic misconduct (Openo & Robinson, 2021, p. 21).

We turned toward knowledge mobilization theory (KMb) to help with this work. Knowledge mobilization is concerned with “getting the right information to the right people in the

right format, at the right time, to influence decision-making” (Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation, 2005, as cited in Padilla, 2020). This translates to understanding your knowledge users (students and faculty), their needs (informing, training, dialoguing), and how best to engage with them (e.g., timing, method, language). While the resources developed through this initiative are not research outputs in the traditional sense, their design was grounded in KMB principles, particularly an emphasis on usability, contextual relevance, and responsiveness to real-world contexts (Community First, 2014). Table 2 indicates the additional resources developed in response to these priorities. The additions are italicized for clarity.

Student-Centred GIF Messaging

Recognizing the importance of delivering relevant and engaging messaging to students, we sought to incorporate the student perspective during this developmental phase. To do so, we hired two Academic Integrity Ambassadors (AIAs) who were current students at the College and had emerging expertise in graphic design and user experience. Their involvement helped create messaging that would better resonate with a student audience in both tone and format. This approach aligns with Zivcakova et al.’s (2012) findings that students may become resistant to messaging efforts when exposed to the same information about academic integrity repeatedly. They suggest that students need varied and timely instruction, scaffolded according to their circumstances. This finding, in tandem with the institutionally specific needs our AIAs identified, led us to develop a GIF series to maximize the impact of our academic integrity messaging. GIFs (short for graphics interchange format), best described as animated images, are commonly used across social media platforms to illustrate simple concepts in a visually engaging manner.

In line with KMB principles, GIFs were designed to be engaging, accessible, and context-specific, delivering timely academic integrity messaging aligned with key points in the academic term (from the first day of class to final exams). This user-centred approach helped ensure the content was relevant and easy to understand, delivering practical and meaningful information when it was most needed (Cooper et al., 2018). It also reflected a shift away from punitive messaging, focusing instead on addressing student concerns before they arise. Each GIF was released to align with important academic milestones. For example, one promoted free online tutoring services prior to the final exam period. Another featured tips from an interview with the College’s copyright specialist on course-sharing sites. This approach not only enabled the delivery of timely messaging in a strategic and creative way; it also fostered collaboration with cross-campus partners, such as librarians, educational developers, and tutors. It allowed us to engage them in conversations about academic integrity while simultaneously promoting their services. Anecdotal feedback from students and other stakeholders was overwhelmingly positive, with many expressing appreciation for the engaging messaging approach.

Table 2. “Academic Integrity Space” Organizational Structure (Phase 2)

Section: Resources for Students – Raising Awareness

Sub-Section: *Announcements*

- *GIFs: Introduction to Academic Integrity; Tutoring Services; Counselling Services; Group Messaging Apps; Academic Integrity Education; Copyright Rules; Visual Plagiarism; Source Code Plagiarism; Wellness & Counselling Services; End-of-Semester Celebration*
- *Poster: Avoiding Course-Sharing Sites*

Sub-Section: Lessons, Activities, and Assessments

- Start of Term Reminder
- Online Game: Learning about Academic Integrity
- Class Presentation: Academic Integrity
- Pre/Post Discussion: Academic Integrity Tutorial
- Reflective Questions: Academic Integrity Tutorial
- Assignments: Email to Professor, Ethical Lapses in the Workplace, Examining Plagiarism

Sub-Section: Assignment Checklists

- Assignment Checklist
- Prewriting Checklist
- Group Work Checklist
- Peer Review Checklist

Sub-Section: Assessment Reminders

- Template: Assignment Reminders

Section: Resources for Faculty – Preventing and Responding to Breaches

Sub-Section: Proactive Pedagogical Approaches to Academic Integrity

- FAQ: A Faculty Guide to Homework Help sites
- Infographics: *A Faculty Guide to Plagiarism; A Faculty Guide to Student Collaboration; A Faculty Guide to Contract Cheating; An Academic Integrity Checklist for Faculty*

Sub-Section: Suspected Breach? Guidelines for Next Steps

- Infographics: *Breach Reporting Process*; Plagiarism or Teachable Moment?; Reporting a Breach; Reporting Form: Breach of Academic Integrity
- Email Templates: Suspected Breach, Remediation Request

Sub-Section: Meeting with a Student about a Suspected Breach?

- Video: General Guidelines for Meeting with a Student

Faculty Guides for Navigating Academic Integrity

Building on the anecdotal success of the GIF series, we developed the Faculty Guide series. This initiative aimed to proactively educate faculty about both emerging forms of aca-

demic misconduct and more ambiguous academic integrity topics. In doing so, we benefitted from having a centralized AIO as staff members often have timely and in-depth insights into evolving academic misconduct trends, usually informed by institutional data and personal involvement in academic integrity practitioner networks. Drawing from this knowledge base, the Faculty Guides were designed to be informative, visually engaging, and accessible, encouraging faculty to consider how they address academic integrity in their own teaching practice. Developing the Faculty Guides was also part of our effort to respond to the emotionally charged nature of academic conduct cases by equipping faculty with clear, supportive guidance for navigating new, complex, or uncertain situations.

Lessons, Activities, and Assessments

Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra (2016) note that faculty members act as ethical role models for students and help to “demonstrate the importance of honesty, integrity, and respect for the learning tradition” (p. 339). Yet, even when they undertake this instruction purposefully, views on integrity can vary or be highly subjective, which leads to inconsistency in how the topic is treated (Löfström et al., 2015). To support faculty members in their role as ethical role models, the Space was populated with lessons, classroom activities, and assessments that focused on raising students’ academic integrity awareness. These ranged from providing general knowledge about academic integrity and institutional expectations (e.g., an online academic integrity game, a slide deck for instructors to use) and resources to supplement and expand on the academic integrity tutorial. Recognizing that community colleges aim to prepare students for the workplace, we also developed an assessment focusing on ethical lapses in the workplace. In addition to academic integrity education, it was deemed important to consider students’ lives beyond college to ensure they are well-prepared to navigate the ethical issues they may face throughout their careers and lives. Drawing on KMB principles, these materials were designed to be practical and responsive to real-world challenges (Cooper et al., 2018; Rowell, 2017).

Academic Integrity Checklists for Student Assignments

When the AIO first launched in 2016, one of the earliest interventions offered to faculty was an academic integrity assignment checklist. Faculty could require students to submit this checklist alongside an assignment as evidence that they took the appropriate steps to ensure their assignment aligned with academic integrity expectations. For instance, besides verifying that citations were used correctly, students would also need to indicate that any third-party assistance they received did not compromise the authenticity of their work and that this work would not be shared with any other individual nor would it be posted to a content-sharing site. Faculty informed the AIO that they found this checklist to be very helpful in educating their students about expectations, and they requested more specialized and scaffolded checklists. To that end, sub-

sequent checklists were developed and uploaded to the Space, including one focused on group work, which aimed to support effective collaboration and help prevent potential academic integrity issues among group members.

Responding to Breaches

Faculty frequently contacted the AIO for guidance when they suspected a breach, indicating that more clarity was needed regarding the College’s process. In response, the AIO developed a one-page infographic outlining the investigation and reporting process in a concise, accessible format. Faculty members’ understanding of plagiarism varied significantly despite its common treatment as a clearly defined concept. Research highlights this inconsistency and notes that institutional definitions usually encompass a wide range of unacceptable behaviours (Greenberger et al., 2016; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014). To address this, we created an infographic detailing the different types of plagiarism, helping faculty to determine whether an incident could be considered academic misconduct, leveraged as a teachable moment, or both. Additionally, an email message template was developed in consultation with the College’s academic managers to help faculty communicate with students about potential breaches. The goal was to promote consistency, and to help ensure student understanding of the breach reporting process and their rights throughout this process in a considerate and equitable tone. A video was also made available through the Space for faculty who might meet with a student to discuss a suspected breach without an academic integrity practitioner present. This video provided a sample script to guide the conversation, offer appropriate support, and encourage a compassionate response to students, recognizing that such meetings could likely cause students stress.

Phase 3: Reflecting and Realigning

Although our early efforts were met with positive feedback, one issue was becoming increasingly clear: hosting the Space via institutional LMS was not achieving the outcomes we had anticipated. While in theory educators could easily copy resources from the Space into their D2L courses, few seemed to be doing so. During the first phase, we had opted to enrol only those faculty members who had already adopted the e-learning tutorial into the Space. Others could be enrolled upon request, but this created uneven access to the repository. This approach also meant that professional staff, such as academic advisors, had no access at all. To better understand its effectiveness, we analysed user data from D2L. Between August 2021 and August 2022, only 375 users had accessed the Space with daily activity fluctuating between 5 and 20. By August 2022, this had dropped to fewer than 5 users per day. These results indicated minimal engagement and highlighted a key concern: our current approach was not equipping faculty members, and by extension, students, to engage in matters of academic integrity productively (Lynch et al., 2021). Recognizing this, we prioritized improving faculty access to the repository. In

the summer of 2022, we collaborated with the College’s communications team to transfer the Academic Integrity Space to a new format.

Centralizing the Space

The Academic Integrity Space—now renamed as the *Academic Integrity Faculty Resources Page*—was restructured in response to faculty needs throughout the academic term. New tools and resources were added, including guidance on preventing academic integrity breaches involving generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools (e.g., “What can I do to prevent AI breaches?”). Importantly, the new centralized website has a ‘hide’ functionality. While the page is accessible to all stakeholders at the College, resources intended for faculty members are not visible to students. This functionality restricts students from accessing materials designed to help faculty detect academic integrity breaches, which students might otherwise exploit to evade detection. As shown in Table 3, five categories were created using an FAQ format to improve the user experience. As with Table 2, resources added during Phase 3 have also been italicized for clarity.

This new space was collaboratively promoted: the communications team placed advertisements in institutional newsletters and across internal channels, while AIO staff delivered presentations to academic managers and faculty and promoted student-facing resources through classroom visits. The AIO received positive feedback from faculty members across the College with many expressing appreciation for the learning tools and resources’ improved accessibility. Faculty also stated they liked the site’s organization, which is structured around key points in the term (e.g., “What can I do in the first week of classes to promote academic integrity?”). This structure made it easier for them to integrate academic integrity content into their courses in a timely way.

Several faculty members have shared how they integrated the resources from the Faculty Resources Page into their teaching, highlighting the tools they found most valuable. Many noted that the breach reporting resources were especially helpful when addressing incidents in their courses. One faculty member shared, “The resources on the breach reporting process have been very helpful (but aren’t really new, just updated), and I use the provided language for emailing students regularly.” This was echoed by another faculty member who described the email templates as “absolute gold.” Faculty also appreciated the recommended language the site offers and the guidance provided for framing assignment expectations. For example, one faculty member mentioned integrating content from *LibGuide: Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence* into assignments to clarify to students when it is acceptable to use GenAI. Another noted plans to use the *Group Work Checklist* when introducing collaborative assignments. A different faculty member said they found *The Faculty Guide to Student Collaboration* especially valuable during the early emergence of GenAI, using it to inform the redesign of their

Table 3. “AI Faculty Resources” Webpage Organizational Structure (Phase 3)

Question	Resources
What can I do in the first week of classes to promote academic integrity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Do’s and Don’ts of Academic Integrity</i> Infographic: Academic Integrity Checklist for Faculty Start of Term Reminder Kahoot!: Learning about Academic Integrity Class Presentation: Academic Integrity Pre/Post Discussion: Academic Integrity Tutorial Reflective Questions: Academic Integrity Tutorial Assignments: Email to Professor, Ethical Lapses in the Workplace, Examining Plagiarism
How do I prepare students for the first assessment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reminders Before Assessment Assignment Checklist Prewriting Checklist Group Work Checklist Peer Review Checklist
What can I do to prevent AI breaches?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infographics: A Faculty Guide to Plagiarism; A Faculty Guide to Student Collaboration; A Faculty Guide to Contract Cheating; <i>A Faculty Guide to AI-Generated Writing, ChatGPT, and AI Detection Tools</i>; <i>A Faculty Guide to Investigating and Substantiating Unauthorized Use of AI Tools</i>; <i>A Faculty Guide to Detecting AI-Generated Text</i> <i>LibGuides: Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence; Contract Cheating and Course-Sharing Websites</i>
What do I do if I suspect a breach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infographics: Breach Reporting Process; Plagiarism or Teachable Moment?; <i>Understanding Level 1 Sanctions</i>; <i>How Academic Integrity Remediation Works</i>; <i>Student Remediation Form</i>; Reporting a Breach Email Templates: Suspected Breach, Remediation Request Quick Link: Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure
Where can I learn more about AI?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>APA Citation Guidelines: How to Cite ChatGPT</i> <i>Transforming Assessment E-Course</i> <i>Institutional Report: Academic Integrity (2022)</i> <i>College and University Educational Resources</i> <i>What is Contract Cheating?</i> <i>15 Strategies to Detect Contract Cheating</i> <i>Substantiating Contract Cheating: A Guide for Investigators</i> <i>International Day of Action Against Contract Cheating Resource Guide</i> <i>Teaching and Learning with Artificial Intelligence Apps</i>

assignments. These testimonials underscore the value of the Faculty Resources Page in promoting academic integrity and supporting faculty in their day-to-day teaching practices.

Since the Space's transition from the LMS to a centralized institutional webpage, uptake has increased significantly. Between August 2022 and February 2023, the page received almost 8,000 views, averaging about 100 views daily. While these metrics suggest greater visibility and interest, they do not capture the full scope of faculty engagement or behavioural change. However, the rise in traffic coincided with an increase in requests for support, including requests for custom-built resources, faculty drop-in sessions, and workshops focused on integrating academic integrity into course content and assessments.

Overall, hosting the Academic Integrity Faculty Resources Page on a centralized site rather than within a closed LMS has offered several benefits:

1. **Open Access:** Manual enrolment is no longer required, allowing comprehensive access for all stakeholders across the College, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students.
2. **Teaching-Focused Structure:** Faculty members can easily locate relevant resources, organized into five categories that reflect typical teaching scenarios and integrity-related challenges encountered throughout a term.
3. **Easy Sharing:** When faculty members request specific resources, links can be shared quickly and conveniently.
4. **Flexible Promotion:** The use of direct links makes it easy to share and promote new resources across high-impact communication channels.
5. **Student Support:** Students now have access to a greater number of academic integrity resources, helping reduce uncertainty around assignment requirements and academic integrity expectations.

Discussion

Academic misconduct is a complex and pervasive problem in higher education. While many institutions have attempted to diminish its risk by relying on e-learning modules to create awareness among students, these efforts are only a starting point. A more comprehensive approach is needed, one that supports faculty who play a central role in educating students about academic integrity. As the literature indicates, faculty perceptions of academic integrity vary, and many seek guidance on how to teach it effectively (Amigud & Pell, 2021; de Maio et al., 2020; MacLeod & Eaton, 2020; Morris & Carroll, 2016). The Academic Integrity Space has emerged as a valuable initiative in this regard, helping to promote consistency in practice across the College. It has provided a flexible format for delivering timely, relevant resources in response to an evolving academic integrity landscape.

A centralized AIO with dedicated staff was critical in developing messaging and resources that resonate with both faculty and students. Drawing on institutional data, policies, and networks, as well as an understanding of the institutional culture, we were able to curate content that met our community's needs. Scholars increasingly recommend formal academic integrity roles to support faculty through training, consultation, and resource development (Andrews & Glendinning, 2024; Gamage et al., 2020; Morris & Carroll, 2016; Saddiqui, 2016). Vogt & Eaton (2022) emphasize the need for academic integrity "champions" to help embed this work across institutions. They caution that when academic integrity is not given the dedicated time or support, it risks becoming a "side-of-desk project," devaluing its importance (p. 25). The development of the Academic Integrity Space demonstrates the need for dedicated professionals who can provide the time, skill, and institutional access to support both faculty and students (Vogt & Eaton, 2022).

Throughout this project's evolution, we learned some key lessons. Faculty often face significant pressures that limit their capacity to engage consistently with academic integrity practices. In addition to increasing workloads, diminishing resources, and precarious employment, faculty must also navigate challenges such as unclear institutional policies, limited training, and inadequate support (Brimble, 2016; Coalter et al., 2007; Crossman, 2019; Saddiqui, 2016). In this context, easy access to practical, high-quality resources is essential. Initially, when the Space was hosted on the institutional LMS, gaining access was not straightforward, which contributed to low engagement. Only 375 users accessed the Space between August 2021 and August 2022, with daily visits rarely exceeding 20. After transitioning the resources to a centralized website with unrestricted access, average daily views rose to approximately 100. This highlights the importance of removing access barriers to foster faculty engagement and widespread use.

From the outset, we hoped the Academic Integrity Space would encourage dialogue and collaboration among faculty. We envisioned the repository resources acting as a catalyst for new ideas, cross-campus conversations, and co-created strategies. While those outcomes are still developing, applying KMB theory has supported steady progress toward those goals. Guided by KMB principles, such as the use of plain language and a focus on stakeholder needs, we aimed to bridge the differences in how faculty understand and practice academic integrity. These same principles influenced our decision to move towards a centralized platform to make our resources more accessible, usable, and relevant for all faculty, no matter their starting point. In keeping with these principles, we also prioritized stakeholder needs throughout the design process. For instance, we involved students in the design process, drawing on their insights to create resources that would resonate with their peers and reflect real student experiences. Also, we translated policy language into a visual infographic and

structured content around key points in an academic term, making the material more relatable and actionable for faculty. While the project has not resulted in widespread faculty collaboration, it has evolved into a widely accessed and valued resource. Looking ahead, we see further potential in continuing to engage with students as partners in this work, as their contributions to resource development have proven instrumental. As academic integrity practitioners, we remain committed to fostering deeper engagement at our respective institutions. Furthermore, we aim to inspire similar efforts for other practitioners and suggest that provincial and national networks in Canada consider hosting shared repositories for use across institutions (McKenzie et al., 2020). From a KMB perspective, this aligns with Cooper et al.'s (2018) emphasis on leveraging intermediaries (e.g., networks) to bridge research and practice, extend reach, and support the broader dissemination of knowledge across institutional boundaries.

Recommendations

For institutions looking to implement a similar initiative, we offer the following key recommendations: (a) assess your institutional context, (b) use a repository to foster collaboration and professional development, and (c) create a space for dialogue and shared impact. Implementing these recommended strategies, grounded in intentional and collaborative practices, can help institutions move beyond reactive approaches and lay the foundation for a more cohesive and collective approach to academic integrity.

Assess Your Institutional Context

Understanding your institution's academic integrity culture is essential to determining relevant resource needs and delivery methods. The AIRS 2.0 tool (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2022) can be used to conduct an institutional needs assessment at the macro level. Alternatively, a needs assessment can be conducted at the micro- or meso-levels as a starting point to determine institutional needs (e.g., Kenny & Eaton, 2022).

Use A Repository to Foster Collaboration and Professional Development

Consider how a centralized repository can serve as more than a collection of resources as it can be used as a platform for faculty engagement. Although most faculty members feel responsible for promoting academic integrity, they often lack a shared understanding and demonstrate inconsistent practices (Amigud & Pell, 2021; de Maio et al., 2020; MacLeod & Eaton, 2020). A centralized resource hub can serve as a foundation for faculty professional development and lead to a shared understanding and consistent practices. For instance, faculty could attend a workshop where they explore available resources, then collaborate with peers from similar disciplines to brainstorm ideas for subject-specific resources. This type of collaboration supports the development of materials better aligned with the norms and expectations of individual disci-

plines, fostering more relevant academic integrity instruction. Such activities may also lead to research projects that extend the repository and contribute to academic integrity scholarship.

Create A Space for Dialogue and Shared Impact

Beyond supporting faculty collaboration, a shared academic integrity space enables new forms of engagement between academic integrity practitioners and faculty. It creates opportunities for knowledge sharing and mobilization, helping institutions develop a unified and proactive approach to academic integrity. These connections can lead to long-term partnerships and position institutions to respond effectively to emerging academic integrity concerns.

Conclusion

This case study illustrates how institutional tools such as an LMS or internal portal can empower faculty to integrate academic integrity instruction more effectively into their teaching. By grounding our approach in practitioner experience, institutional data, and ongoing feedback, we created a flexible and accessible platform that supports faculty in real and practical ways. As the Academic Integrity Space developed into the Academic Integrity Resources Page, it was met with positive feedback from faculty who valued the resources' improved accessibility, organization, and practical relevance. While fostering widespread faculty collaboration remains an ongoing goal, this initiative's evolution demonstrates the value of a practitioner-led approach that prioritizes relevance to faculty and student contexts, meaningful engagement, and community building. As institutions continue to navigate emerging academic integrity challenges, this model offers a scalable framework for building shared responsibility and strengthening engagement across the academic community.

Received

September 12, 2024

Accepted

May 5, 2025

Published online

June 6, 2025

References

- Amigud, A., & Pell, D. J. (2021). When academic integrity rules should not apply: A survey of academic staff. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46, 928–942. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1826900>
- Andrews, S., & Glendinning, I. (2024). Governing academic integrity: Conceptualizing the assurance and efficacy of strategies and outcomes. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (p. 1081–1112). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_185

- Bertram Gallant, T. (2018). Part-time integrity? contingent faculty and academic integrity. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2018*, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20316>
- Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., ... Partridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 7*, 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v7i2.759>
- Brimble, M. (2016). Why students cheat: An exploration of the motivators of student academic dishonesty in higher education. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 365–382). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_58
- Chibry, N., & Kurz, E. (2022). Pay-to-pass: Evolving online systems that undermine the integrity of student work. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: Ethics and integrity in educational contexts* (p. 203–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_10
- Chugh, R., Luck, J. A., Turnbull, D., & Pember, E. R. (2021). Back to the classroom: Educating sessional teaching staff about academic integrity. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 19*, 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09390-9>
- Coalter, T., Chi Lo, L., & Wanorie, T. (2007). Factors that influence faculty actions: A study on faculty responses to academic dishonesty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*, Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijso.2007.010112>
- Community First. (2014, November 24). *So what the heck is knowledge mobilization and why should i care?* Research Impact Canada. <https://researchimpact.ca/archived/so-what-the-heck-is-knowledge-mobilization-and-why-should-i-care/>
- Cooper, A., Rodway, J., & Read, R. (2018). Knowledge mobilization practices of educational researchers across Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 48*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050839ar>
- Coren, A. (2011). Turning a blind eye: Faculty who ignore student cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 9*, 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9147-y>
- Crossman, K. (2019). Is this in my contract?: How part-time contract faculty face barriers to reporting academic integrity breaches. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, 2*, 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v2i1.68934>
- de Maio, C., Dixon, K., & Yeo, S. (2020). Responding to student plagiarism in Western Australian universities: The disconnect between policy and academic staff. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 42*, 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1662927>
- East, J. (2016). Educational responses to academic integrity. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 481–496). Springer Reference. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_33
- Gamage, K. A. A., De Silva, E. K., & Gunawardhana, N. (2020). Online delivery and assessment during COVID-19: Safeguarding academic integrity. *Education Sciences, 10*, Article 301. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10110301>
- Gottardello, D., & Karabag, S. F. (2022). Ideal and actual roles of university professors in academic integrity management: A comparative study. *Studies in Higher Education, 47*, 526–544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1767051>
- Greenberger, S., Holbeck, R., Steele, J., & Dyer, T. (2016). Plagiarism due to misunderstanding: Online instructor perceptions. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 16*, 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i6.20062>
- Hamilton, M., & Wolsky, K. (2022). The barriers to faculty reporting incidences of academic misconduct at community colleges. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (p. 467–485). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_24
- Henslee, A. M., Murray, S. L., Olbricht, G. R., Ludlow, D. K., Hays, M. E., & Nelson, H. M. (2017). Assessing freshman engineering students' understanding of ethical behavior. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 23*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9749-2>
- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2022). *Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS)*. <http://www.academicintegrity.org/ica/assess/AIRS.pdf>
- Jenkins, B. D., Golding, J. M., Le Grand, A. M., Levi, M. M., & Pals, A. M. (2022). When opportunity knocks: College students' cheating amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Teaching of Psychology, 50*, 407–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00986283211059067>
- Kenny, N., & Eaton, S. E. (2022). Academic integrity through a SoTL lens and 4m framework: An institutional self-study. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (p. 573–592). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_30
- Kezar, A., & Bernstein-Sierra, S. (2016). Commercialization of higher education. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 325–346). Springer Reference. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_59
- Lynch, J., Salamonson, Y., Glew, P., & Ramjan, L. M. (2021). “i’m not an investigator and i’m not a police officer”: A faculty’s view on academic integrity in an undergraduate nursing degree. *International Journal for Educa-*

- tional Integrity*, 17, Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00086-6>
- Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., & Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education*, 69, 435–448. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43648803>
- MacLeod, P. D., & Eaton, S. E. (2020). The paradox of faculty attitudes toward student violations of academic integrity. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09363-4>
- Marques, T., Reis, N., & Gomes, J. (2019). A bibliometric study on academic dishonesty research. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09328-2>
- McKenzie, A., Miron, J., & Ridgley, A. (2020). Building a regional academic integrity network: Profiling the growth and action of the Academic Integrity Council of Ontario. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 3, 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v3i1.69836>
- Miron, J., McKenzie, A., Eaton, S. E., Stoesz, B., Thacker, E., Devereaux, L., ... Rowbotham, K. (2021). Academic integrity policy analysis of publicly-funded universities in ontario, Canada: A focus on contract cheating. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 197. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1083333ar>
- Morris, E. J., & Carroll, J. (2016). Developing a sustainable holistic institutional approach: Dealing with realities ‘on the ground’ when implementing an academic integrity policy. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_23-2
- Olafson, L., Schraw, G., & Kehrwald, N. (2014). Academic dishonesty: Behaviors, sanctions, and retention of adjudicated college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55, 661–674. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2014.0066>
- Openo, J. A., & Robinson, R. (2021). The emotional labour of academic integrity: How does it feel? *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 4, 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v4i1.71350>
- Padilla, E. (2020, November 30). *The significant role of metadata in knowledge mobilization (KMb): Mobilizing BCcampus OER into active use*. [Video]. University of British Columbia. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0400903>
- Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 269–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056>
- Pethrick, H. (2020, July 3). *Academic integrity week programming for faculty members: An environmental scan*. University of Calgary. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED606275.pdf>
- Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 196–209. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3648255>
- Reinke, N. B., Hatje, E., Parkinson, A. L., & Kynn, M. (2024). It (still) takes a village: From academic dishonesty to a culture of academic integrity. In M. B. Rao, A. Singh, & P. M. Rao (Eds.), *Worldviews and values in higher education: Teaching, learning, curricula, and assessment* (p. 81–94). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80262-897-520241006>
- Richards, D., Saddiqui, S., White, F., McGuigan, N., & Home-wood, J. (2016). A theory of change for student-led academic integrity. *Quality in Higher Education*, 22, 242–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2016.1265849>
- Rowell, L. (2017). Knowledge mobilization and action research in global contexts: Towards a comparative orientation. *Educational Action Research*, 25, 333–336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2017.1326759>
- Saddiqui, S. (2016). Engaging students and faculty: Examining and overcoming the barriers. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 1009–1036). Springer Reference. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_18
- Sefcik, L., Striepe, M., & Yorke, J. (2020). Mapping the landscape of academic integrity education programs: What approaches are effective? *Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45, 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1604942>
- Stephens, J. M., Watson, P. W. S. J., Alansari, M., Lee, G., & Turnbull, S. M. (2021). Can online academic integrity instruction affect university students’ perceptions of and engagement in academic dishonesty? Results from a natural experiment in New Zealand. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 569133. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.569133>
- Stoesz, B. M., Seeland, J., MacLeod, P., Vogt, L., Markovics, L., Denham, T., ... Usick, B. (2020). Creating a collaborative network to promote cultures of academic integrity in Manitoba’s post-secondary institutions. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 3, 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v3i1.69763>
- Stoesz, B. M., & Yuditseva, A. (2018). Effectiveness of tutorials for promoting educational integrity: A synthesis paper. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0030-0>
- Striepe, M., Thomson, S., & Sefcik, L. (2021). Understanding academic integrity education: Case studies from two Australian universities. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09429-x>

- Thomas, A., & De Bruin, G. P. (2012). Student academic dishonesty: What do academics think and do and what are the barriers to action? *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 6, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.15249/6-1-8>
- Vogt, L., & Eaton, S. E. (2022). Make it someone's job: Documenting the growth of the academic integrity profession through a collection of position postings. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 5, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v5i1.74195>
- Zivcakova, L., Wood, E., Baetz, M., & De Pasquale, D. (2012). How do faculty members respond to their students' discussions of academic misconduct and academic integrity? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 8, 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEL.v8i1.782>