Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, *8*(1), 1-9
http://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/cpai.v8.i1/81066
Peer-reviewed

Infusing Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) into Academic Integrity Practices in Canadian Higher Education

Anita Chaudhuri [*1] , Anita Lam[2] , Kirsty Spence[3] , and Matt Rahimian[4]

Abstract
Based on our experiences at four Canadian institutions of higher education, we contend that infusing EDI-informed language within academic integrity policy and procedures is important and should be supported by (a) a transformative approach toward academic integrity that shifts away from a "morality and rule compliance" framework (Penaluna & Ross, 2022); (b) asking questions such as "what do we, as instructors and institutions, need to unlearn?" (McNeill, 2022) to cultivate belongingness and learning together about diverse systems and cultures of knowledge making (Davis, 2022); and (c) training students, staff, and instructors about ways to highlight aspirational aspects of integrity to diminish anxiety-ridden misconduct processes. To balance the maintenance of rigorous academic standards against the development of a more learning-centred culture of academic integrity, we believe EDI-informed best practices should be established at a systems level across multiple stakeholders responsible for different learning contexts. As a road map for structuring educative opportunities for students in multiple teaching and learning contexts, we consider sites where revised practices might be most impactful, including instructor-led classroom teaching, administrator-led decision making and disciplinary processes, and staff-led and student-centred programming (e.g., orientation, peer mentoring, learning services sessions).

Keywords
academic integrity, academic misconduct, EDI, multi-stakeholder approach, student-centred culture

[1]Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies (FCCS), University of British Columbia
[2]Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies, York University
[3]Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, Brock University
[4]Writing and Learning Services, Huron at Western University

[*]**Corresponding author**: anita.chaudhuri@ubc.ca
Anita Chaudhuri, FCCS, University of British Columbia, 1148 Research Road, Discovery Ave, Kelowna, BC V1V1V7, Canada

Introduction

Between pursuing internationalization and making higher education more accessible to equity-deserving groups, Canadian higher education is demographically more diverse than ever before. To recognize the diversity of today's learners in the context of a student-centred culture in higher education (Openo, 2019), academic integrity policies at Canadian universities and colleges are increasingly embedding language on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI). As Grewal (n.d.) cogently argued, EDI itself is an acronym that packages together three separate ideas or constructs. Although definitions of these terms are in flux and continue to evolve, inclusion often refers to "an active, intentional, and continuous process to address inequities in power and privilege, and to build a respectful and diverse community that ensures welcoming spaces and opportunities to flourish for all" (Equity and Inclusion Office [EIO], 2023). Being inclusive and equitable requires a proactive approach that recognizes diversity as the "differences in the social identities and lived experiences and perspectives of people that may include race, ethnicity, colour, ancestry, place of origin, political belief, religion, marital status, family status, physical disability, mental disability, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, age, class, and/or socio-economic situations" (EIO, 2023).

To address individuals' diverse identities, experiences, and perspectives, equitable practice is important for "achieving parity in policy, process and outcomes for historically, persistently or systematically marginalized people and groups while accounting for diversity" (EIO, 2023). In the context of higher education, we believe all three terms require us to recognize differences in both people and academic work practices, such that we can embrace varied approaches to teaching and learning instead of presuming that students must follow the confines of a single, homogenous learning path. Through

such recognition, we can see differences in learning expectations emerge from the diverse lived experiences of students, instructors, administrators and staff, making it even more important for universities to create and cultivate an inclusive learning environment for all community members.

EDI and Academic Integrity

In considering the implementation of EDI in academic integrity practices, we agree with researchers that institutions have capacity to address learning precarity (McDermott, 2024), transform education to imbue alternate learning and cultural paradigms (Head, 2024), nurture "safe spaces for learning" (Stoesz, 2024, p. 205), and empower students to participate in decision-making processes (Moya, 2023). Proactive inclusive practices will increase the chances of success of academic integrity initiatives. We discuss our views using three general objectives: interconnectedness, empowerment narrative, and feasibility.

Objective 1: Interconnectedness

While equity, diversity, and inclusion can be distinct terms, they can also intersect, interact, and interconnect in multiple ways. In the context of academic integrity, however, the interconnected meaning of EDI has yet to be consistently operationalized. For some (e.g., Eaton, 2020), EDI considerations emerge in the context of negative student outcomes from academic misconduct procedures, where racial and cultural diversity are explicitly or implicitly problematized, e.g. when faculty members disproportionately report racialized and/or international students—especially from non-White and non-English speaking countries—as potential threats to academic integrity. Although MacLeod & Eaton (2020) noted that Canadian faculty members report only about one-third of all detected academic misconduct, racialized students tend to be overrepresented in such cases (Beasley, 2016; Bertram Gallant et al., 2015; Bretag, 2019; Christensen Hughes, 2010).

Objective 2: Empowerment Narrative

Other researchers have noted that EDI is typically framed within an empowerment narrative, where learners are changemakers, perceived to have the agency to "contribute to individual, community, and social change" (Wolbring & Nguyen, 2023, p. 172). While this narrative is meant to be positive, publishing EDI-centred institutional commitments may not fully represent the concerns of equity-seekers because the resulting policies are fundamentally based on "Eurocentric thought" (Battiste, 2005, p.2), may capture instead the context of "elite racism" in higher education (Petrina & Ross, 2021, p. 21), and can exist alongside a lack of "equitable access" (Maple League of Universities, 2022, 25:44), as well as "anti-racist and equity-focused teaching practices" (Maple League of Universities, 2022, 25:40). Focusing on higher education practices that contribute to "Indigenous marginalization," Head (2024), for example, argues that "the way reconciliation, inclusion, diversity, and equity are conceptualized in academia further marginalizes the embodiments of Indigenous learning, integrity, and relationality" (pp. 1273-1274), creating a rift in student identity, learning goals, and objectives. Additionally, McDermott (2024) highlights the case of "other" learners whose "behaviours of non-normative body-minds ... are labelled as indicators of academic misconduct" (p. 1169), especially in test environments.

Objective 3: Feasibility

With inequities embedded in post-secondary education, several questions arise related to the feasibility of implementing core and exemplary elements of academic integrity policy (see Bretag et al., 2011). As a response to questions of practical implementation, this paper focuses on how institutions can enact EDI-informed practices in academic integrity processes and procedures, as well as teaching practices (see also, e.g., Stoesz, 2024). While integrating EDI-informed language within academic integrity policies can symbolically reflect an institution's core values, including such value-laden language does not, by itself, indicate how instructors, staff, and administrators can and should enact EDI-informed practices in academic integrity processes, whether in classrooms, academic misconduct disciplinary processes (i.e., adjudication hearings), or non-academic skill development sessions. As such, we operationalize EDI-informed academic integrity practices as those that incorporate a more inclusive process for providing equitable learning opportunities to an increasingly diverse student body. By focusing on educative opportunities, we take an institution-wide, multi-stakeholder approach to enacting academic integrity across different teaching and learning contexts, precisely because academic integrity is only upheld when everyone takes responsibility for academic integrity policy and processes, "including university management, academic and professional staff, and students" (Bretag & Mahmud, 2016, p. 473).

Our Approach

Drawing from our specific points of reference as instructors, staff, and administrators across four Canadian post-secondary institutions, we outline shared EDI-informed best practices that our peers can establish within their institutions across different learning contexts. Given that learning about academic integrity requires practice through multiple learning opportunities over time (Morris & Carroll, 2016; Stoesz & Eaton, 2020), we consider diverse learning contexts where revising academic integrity practices might be most impactful. While considering the diverse stakeholders who might be held responsible for upholding academic integrity, the following sections explore different institutional sites and processes, including instructor-led classroom teaching, administrator-led disciplinary and decision-making processes, and staff-led and student-centred academic integrity programming (e.g., during sessions at orientation and/or with learning services and peer-mentors).

Instructor-led Classroom Teaching

Providing language in the syllabus on academic integrity underlines instructors' expectation that students "know, understand, and follow the codes of conduct regarding academic integrity" (Suggested academic integrity statement, n.d.) before a course commences for a term. While understanding policy may be valuable, Stoesz & Eaton's 2020 study of Canadian institutions found that academic integrity policies are often "focused on policing, reporting, investigating, and sanctioning student engagement" (p. 1542). At Western University in London, Ontario, for example, the institution mandates instructors include "a statement on academic offences" on all course syllabi (Centre for Teaching and Learning, n.d.). This shows how academic integrity policies are framed within a negative discourse of "breakdown" and "offence," both of which can result in "harsh sanctions" for students. While Bretag et al. (2011) saw the hopeful emergence of "an ideological shift … beginning to focus… on instilling positive scholarly values in students" (p. 4), the reframing of integrity as an educative practice remains a work in progress. In fact, Stoesz & Eaton (2020) have commented on the disappointingly slow progress towards an educative approach to academic integrity.

We believe the mere addition of a strict course policy, especially one that uses a negative, punitive frame, is insufficient for helping students actually learn about academic integrity. To "restore the idea of the students' responsibility for their learning," Chankova (2020, p. 170) suggested instructors should view students' involvement in their own learning process as a missing link for academic integrity practice. For Bertram Gallant (2017), instructors' choice to discuss instances of academic misconduct with students in class can result in "teachable moments" (p. 91), as they shift the focus from punitive practice to restorative learning. We argue that such teachable moments are about both framing an educative mindset to "enhance learning" (Bertram Gallant, 2017, p. 92) and fostering equitable and inclusive teaching practices that acknowledge diverse learning engagements, differences between knowledge seekers and their learning objectives, distinct learning preferences, and non-normative learning behaviours, to name a few examples.

To incorporate EDI in teaching practices about academic integrity, we recommend that instructors explore both classroom- and institution-level expectations with students. For example, when instructors explicitly discuss key policy definitions with students, they can highlight expectations and common misstep areas while operationalizing academic integrity "best practices" and common departures relative to learning activities. For example, at Brock University, instructors often speak with students about the academic integrity administrative process, and some even partner with their Faculty Associate Dean, the administrator responsible for adjudicating academic integrity decisions, to speak with students in first-year classes about the academic integrity process and how decisions are made. In partnering with administration in this way, the instructor can make policy and process more concrete, proximal, and salient for students. When instructors initiate proactive discussions about academic integrity with students at all years of study, they offer an inclusive learning opportunity that can engage and benefit all students. Furthermore, when instructors embed academic integrity best practices in courses, they actively articulate and teach disciplinary expectations and field-based practices to prepare students in ways that align with their own academic and professional practices.

In discussing institutional expectations, instructors may deliberately contextualize the purpose of learning while supporting students (Bretag & Mahmud, 2016). While doing so may or may not heighten students' ownership of their own responsibility, such discussions help to both frame the instructor's values and students' collective awareness and invite all to be active participants in meeting these expectations. Dalal (2015) called for instructors' "mindfulness, empathy, and skilful dialogue" (p. 1) and advocated for a "reflective approach" when engaging in critical self-reflection about academic integrity. In this way, instructors would respectfully guide and assist students with their understanding of academic integrity policy while explaining common terms (e.g., policy breach, plagiarism, contract cheating) to demonstrate equitable and inclusive learning. Instructors' critical reflexive engagement may also lead to further conceptual discussions with students about unconscious bias, procedural fairness practices, and an asset-based approach to show how instructional practice and a course promotes equitable and inclusive learning. Instructor-led discussions on institutional policies are also opportunities for students to share their learning preferences and provide peer advice to students who may be less familiar with the academic expectations of Canadian higher education. Instructors can address students' cultural and social anxieties by discussing what constitutes academic misconduct, possible missteps, and preventative measures and resources.

New entrants to post-secondary education often have limited opportunities to openly discuss academic integrity. For example, most students are introduced to academic integrity through either short segments in university preparation courses or by completing learning modules as part of a checklist of course activities. Instructor-led and classroom-level discussions are focused settings where discipline-based expectations on academic integrity may be more effectively presented. Moreover, during such discussions, the instructor can take an intersectional approach to recognize diverse student identities and equitable and inclusive learning practices that inform a transformative teaching and learning pedagogy. Classrooms can become safe spaces where instructors discuss academic misconduct constructively and objectively with students, separate from projecting notions of shame, guilt, and punishment, and/or employing harsh punitive measures. Finally, instructors can direct attention to course goals and how understanding academic integrity policy and practice will prepare students to be successful and advance toward their personal and/or

professional aspirations.

Administrator-led Disciplinary and Decision-making Processes

Tensions arise when the language of EDI is translated into administrator-led academic misconduct processes that have been traditionally oriented toward disciplining and punishing students. Conceptually, it is peculiar to think about ways to enhance inclusion in processes originally designed to single out particular students for exclusion from the larger academic community (e.g., through academic penalties involving suspensions and expulsions). In an examination of academic integrity policies, Stoesz & Eaton (2020) found that Canadian universities tend to heavily focus on investigations of academic offences and punitive approaches. Unsurprisingly then, institutional policy descriptions of academic integrity breaches borrow stigmatizing language (e.g., by describing such breaches as offences), as well as disciplinary rationales and processes from the criminal justice system (e.g., meting out harsher sanctions for 're-offenders'). Moreover, those enacting policy often inquire about a student's 'priors' to learn about a student's history of academic misconduct. Some universities may also use the language of guilt in their academic misconduct process, so that the accused student may 'plead guilty' or be 'found guilty' of an academic offence and be issued a 'warning' letter cautioning the student about further punitive measures if in the event of 'reoffending.' As in an adversarial system, the academic misconduct hearing is designed to bring together the accused and the accuser to hear 'both sides of the story,' while ignoring the ongoing instructor-student power dynamics that underlie and continue to shape the encounter. If a student is 'found guilty' due to mounting or overwhelming evidence, the administrator applies sanctions according to guidelines that take into consideration aggravating factors (e.g., the severity of the offence) and mitigating factors (e.g., extenuating personal circumstances, procedural irregularities).

Students often experience the academic misconduct process and subsequent outcome(s) as punitive rather than educative since academic misconduct is often framed by academic integrity policymakers as a student's lack of morals (Stoesz & Eaton, 2020) or by instructors as a "crime against the academic community of enlightened Western scholars" by students from "other cultures" (Leask, 2006, p. 183). Because universities and colleges not only have an educational mission but also a commitment to educate their students, we recommend enacting some impactful transformations to administrator-led academic misconduct hearings. For example, instead of making the hearing a site for applying prescriptive ethics, the meeting could serve as a reflective catalyst for offering students important learning opportunities about academic integrity, especially if practices were reformed in the following interconnected ways.

First, we advise administrators leading the academic misconduct hearing to shift away from morally framing accused students as 'lazy,' 'incompetent,' or 'immoral.' Such framing facilitates negative stereotyping of specific student cohorts (e.g., by presuming international students are more likely to cheat, as revealed by Bretag et al., 2014), conflates academic rule violations with inherent character flaws, and brings disintegrative shaming into academic integrity processes. As Braithwaite (1989) argued, disintegrative shaming is typically characteristic of formal trials and state sanctions, in which an offender is not only denounced for wrongdoing but is also condemned as a 'bad' person and is personally shamed. When criminal justice systems operate with disintegrative shaming, no attempt is made to reintegrate the offender back into the community. By contrast, reintegrative shaming distinguishes between the offender as a person and the offender's actions, seeking only to condemn the individual's 'bad' actions. Applying these insights to an academic misconduct hearing, administrators can facilitate reintegrative shaming by expressing disapproval of a student's actions in the context of the portion of the academic policy that most applies to the misconduct while asking reflective questions of the student to encourage greater responsibility-taking for their learning and avoidance of future acts of academic misconduct, all of which can help the student be (re)included in the academic community.

Second, we recommend that administrators increasingly consider educative rather than punitive sanctions for students, especially in plagiarism cases where the student's rule-breaking or misconduct revolves around citational issues.[1] In the context of an academic misconduct hearing, an educative sanction can become a means for reintegrating the student into the university's learning community and enable those involved to shift toward adopting a growth mindset. As Dweck (2006) outlined, a growth mindset is tied to beliefs that one's abilities, skills, and personal qualities are learned and can be improved over time; conversely, a fixed mindset is oriented to beliefs that one's abilities and personal qualities cannot be changed. When staff members, instructors, or administrators discuss a student's wrongdoing in terms of 'fixed' character traits (e.g., lack of personal integrity or intellectual ability), they run the risk of cultivating a fixed mindset for students caught in the web of academic integrity processes, especially if students are not offered an alternative way to frame their experience of academic misconduct. In an academic misconduct hearing, administrators can help students adopt a growth mindset when they recommend educative sanctions, precisely because such sanctions can offer students a learning opportunity to academically and personally grow from their failure (e.g., represented by future compliance with academic rules and writing conventions).

[1] Plagiarism, in particular, raises questions about how students learn about academic conventions and expectations that are foreign to them given their previous learning contexts. For example, international students from non-English speaking countries may find Western-style referencing rules to be quite strange.

Anecdotally, growing evidence shows educative sanctions are effective; they can help students learn about academic integrity practices and decrease the likelihood that students will engage in further academic misconduct at the university. For example, in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, a library workshop on academic integrity was recommended as an educative sanction for students who have engaged in academic misconduct (e.g., plagiarism and cheating) in Canada's largest liberal arts faculty. Workshop facilitators explained different kinds of academic misconduct and offered students strategies for approaching academic work, including tips for citing sources and conducting research. Among the 254 students[2] who attended the workshop from March 2021 to 2023, only 7 students (2.75%) committed another academic integrity policy breach, post-workshop.

Educative sanctions can also be included in the academic misconduct process through a diversionary process, where the administrator can redirect discussion and review of academic misconduct away from a formal hearing and toward developing an integrity plan. When administrators divert students away from disciplinary processes to focus instead on learning, they involve students in the development of a concrete plan of action focused on "developmental and educative outcomes" where students are given an opportunity to "learn from their mistakes" (Office of Academic Integrity, n.d.). At the end of the diversionary process, students may not receive an academic penalty, and the breach may not remain on the student's record. At UBC, this recent addition to academic integrity regulations has been received as a positive commitment toward inclusive practice.

Staff-led and Student-centred Programming

In post-secondary institutions, staff-led and student-centred programming on academic literacy often includes educative opportunities for students to learn about academic integrity norms and practices. Addressing EDI in such educational programs is crucial given our expectation that students should uphold academic integrity and be held accountable for their actions (Morris, 2023). Scholars support the integration of academic integrity education in both in-course teaching and out-of-curriculum learning (Morris, 2015; Rahimian, 2023). Regardless of promotional and educational initiatives, however, educators feel they must support students in learning about academic missteps so students can move forward in a stronger fashion (Jamieson & Mertiny, 2024; Morris, 2023; Sopcak & Hood, 2022; van As & Kluyts, 2023). As such, we suggest three categories of programming initiatives, within which staff and academic integrity practitioners can implement EDI principles: (1) training and education on academic integrity, (2) integrating academic integrity into curricula, and (3) providing education after students' first case of academic misconduct.

First, regarding training and education on academic integrity, initiatives can include student orientation sessions, peer mentorship programs, and workshop sessions offered in writing centres and academic learning services to educate students on writing and academic conventions (e.g., paraphrasing, referencing mechanics) and academic integrity processes (e.g., academic integrity scenarios and solutions). Typically facilitated by support staff (e.g., learning and academic integrity specialists) and peer mentors in the university setting, the two purposes of such programming are to a) introduce students to academic integrity policy conventions and institutional expectations regarding academic integrity and to b) support students' learning about future strategies to maintain academic integrity. Facilitators can lead these informational sessions by expressing a value-based system (i.e., valuing and demonstrating honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage) while articulating caution against plagiarism and cheating. Integrating EDI principles and language can be central to these programs, giving students an opportunity to share their diverse learning practices while learning about institutional policy on academic integrity. For example, when leading sessions, staff can serve as sounding boards for international students or first-generation learners; they can acknowledge students' diverse learning styles and raise student awareness of equitable and inclusive ways to seek support when faced with a learning challenge. They can also support students in developing further ownership and responsibility for engaging in their learning.

Second, we suggest that staff members use the backward design model when integrating EDI and academic integrity principles and language into curricular and co-curricular activities. The backward design model McTighe & Wiggins (2004) discussed suggests three steps in designing courses and academic programs: developing program and course objectives, identifying objective achievement markers, and planning instruction to achieve those objectives. The model has been explored and practically evaluated by scholars in the field of education (e.g., Dazeley et al., 2025, McCreary, 2022, Mills et al., 2019). As an "objectives-based approach" (Richards, 2013, p. 21), backward design assumes that specific educational objectives are met by practicing academic integrity. Through a needs analysis of the student community, such objectives can be identified to improve decisions on content and organization of training material. The backward design process can highlight core learning expectations by following a stepwise progression of instructional activities to integrate academic integrity principles while revisiting and revising course or co-curricular learning (and other) outcomes.

Adding academic integrity and EDI principles at the program and course objective development stage can inform assessment and enhance the value of student learning. Take, for example, a learning outcome from Cross-Cultural Education

[2] In this sample, 130 students had engaged in one academic integrity breach, 113 students in two breaches, and 11 students in 3 breaches.

course at the University of Manitoba, which states, "Upon completion of this course you should be able to: engage in a process of critical self-reflection on issues of identity and diversity with specific emphasis but not limited to race, culture, class, language, and gender" (University of Manitoba, 2016). **(reference needed)** To incorporate academic integrity, the objective can be revised as follows:

> Upon completion of this course you should be able to: engage in a process of critical self-reflection on issues of identity and diversity with specific emphasis on but not limited to race, culture, class, language, and gender by drafting an early journal and an end-of-the-term journal on each of these elements and comparing the two drafts. The journals need to be individually completed.

By acknowledging the value of metacognition as an achievement marker in comparing self-reflections and expecting individual work to facilitate inclusive learning, elements of EDI-informed academic integrity have been incorporated. The revised learning outcome also facilitates instructional design as the instructor can plan to teach the expectations of a critical self-reflexive process. Lastly, we recommend revisiting the course syllabus or program outline to ensure alignment exists among all sections (Rahimian, 2023).

Using the backward design model can ensure a coordinated approach at each stage when concurrently integrating EDI and academic integrity principles and language within the curriculum. Consider another example of an articulated learning objective guiding a student-centred workshop on thesis statement development: "At the end of this workshop, participants can find three to five resources related to their general topic, read the relevant sections, and write one or two paragraphs of their understanding of the resources" (Rahimian, 2018). By infusing both EDI and academic integrity principles, we may rewrite the objective in the following way:

> At the end of this workshop, participants *have found* three to five resources related to their general topic, *have read* the relevant sections, *have written* one or two paragraphs of their understanding of the resources, participants *have provided proper citation for their synthesis*.

Being aware that students' diverse backgrounds will mitigate them having different research skills and referencing experience ensures us that by modifying the workshop's objectives, we can both educate all students to learn by doing and promote academic integrity by having participants properly cite text.

Third, staff-led student support programming can include educational sessions after students commit their first case of academic misconduct in academic work. We argue that all support staff should be trained on ways to integrate EDI principles in their practice and learning advice, as well as ways to respond to students by demonstrating a clear understanding of the institutional academic integrity policy and how it applies in the student's specific case. Additionally, staff must help students identify ways to maintain academic integrity after their first case of misconduct and respond to the student in equitable and inclusive ways by focusing on the learning opportunity instead of on the student's shame or failure. For example, expanding the institutional role of a key support staff member (e.g., an Ombudsperson or Academic Integrity Specialist) could help to both support and guide students through academic integrity policy and procedural matters and support staff on matters of procedural fairness. This individual could also provide staff with implicit bias training as a starting point to learn about systemic bias, discrimination, and prejudice. Such training could highlight academic sanctions' impact on student learning and well-being, outline criteria for decision making on academic misconduct, stress the importance of actively listening to students, and determine ways to create accessible learning opportunities. We believe it is crucial that academic integrity (staff) practitioners provide timely support while taking an educative stance, given their student-centred focus.

Although academic integrity is viewed as essential for quality education, we recognize that its effective practices can be circumvented due to resource crunches at post-secondary institutions. Understaffed offices, especially those reliant on limited-term staff positions, may not be able to offer training, impactful advocacy, and/or hold timely case hearings. In arguing for EDI-informed practices at a time of limited institutional resources, we recognize that we must also advocate for our colleagues who are expected to raise the standard of education while facing job precarity and its adverse impacts on the learning community. As such, we appreciate the work conducted by several provincially-based academic integrity networks in Canada, such as the Alberta Academic Integrity Network and British Columbia Academic Integrity Network. By providing an open discursive space to meet and share resources, these semi-formal venues are vital for cultivating an educative approach to academic integrity–one that can both integrate principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion and build inter-institutional capacities for strengthening academic integrity practices.

Conclusion

We see that "a sense of balance" needs to be brought to policy "documents to communicate a multi-faceted (and multi-stakeholder) approach to academic integrity and academic misconduct" (Stoesz & Eaton, 2020, p. 1542). Therefore, we operationalized EDI in this paper as a set of best practices that could be embedded in academic integrity processes and procedures; these inclusive practices would enable and facilitate equitable learning opportunities to an increasingly diverse student body. In doing so through a multi-stakeholder approach (i.e., instructors, administrators, student support staff), we

highlighted multiple 'teachable moments' respective stakeholder groups could implement when offering students opportunities to learn about academic integrity across diverse teaching and learning contexts.

Such approaches can be implemented at multiple levels across the institution. For example, instructors engaging in proactive dialogue with students about academic integrity may foster equitable and inclusive learning practices by acknowledging diverse learning styles and engagements, while students may cultivate responsibility for their own learning processes. Administrators leading academic misconduct hearings may use reintegrative shaming as an alternative frame for thinking about the desired outcomes of such hearings on student learning and well-being. In contrast to the stigmatizing effects associated with punitive sanctions, condemnation, and disintegrative shaming, a reintegrative framework can enable administrators to increasingly recommend educative sanctions to students, thus precipitating students' development of a growth mindset. In this way, students not only learn from their academic mistakes but also learn the crucial academic skills they will need to fully participate in the university's various learning communities. For staff practitioners and student peer mentors, EDI-informed, student-centred programming will be crucial for educating students on how academic integrity norms and practices are integral to their academic literacy development. While not exhaustive, staff and academic integrity practitioners can implement EDI principles in academic integrity orientation/workshop sessions and peer mentorship programs, in curricula with the use of the backward design model, and educational workshops after students' first case of academic misconduct. To strengthen opportunities for success, we recommend specific training of key staff members on ways to integrate EDI principles in leading workshops and supporting students, particularly on matters of procedural fairness and implicit bias.

Given our direct experiences of EDI-informed academic integrity practices at four different Canadian universities and our various roles and positions at our respective institutions (i.e., instructor, administrator, staff), we offer a multi-stakeholder approach in this paper to enhancing academic integrity practices in Canadian higher education. We realize, however, that our perspectives and experiences do not encompass all Canadian post-secondary institutions and may not account for ongoing and future changes to university policies (e.g., institution-wide EDI or academic integrity policies) and academic practices (e.g., how institutions respond to addressing and teaching generative artificial intelligence to students).

That said, we believe institutional stakeholders may be best positioned to deal with the complexity of infusing EDI-informed practices in academic integrity processes and procedures when they adopt a pan-institutional approach and work collaboratively on multiple initiatives across diverse teaching and learning contexts. Rather than consider EDI as an 'add-on' or afterthought, a university's various stakeholders must challenge themselves to operationalize the combined meaning of EDI across the institution's multiple policies and practices, and reimagine how academic integrity can be embedded in more inclusive, equitable, and diverse learning opportunities both inside and outside the classroom.

References

Battiste, M. (2005). Indigenous knowledge: Foundations for First Nations. *WINHEC: International Journal of Indigenous Education Scholarship*, *1*, 1-17. https://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/winhec/article/view/19251

Beasley, E. M. (2016). Comparing the demographics of students reported for academic dishonesty to those of the overall student population. *Ethics & Behavior*, *26*(1), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.978977

Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). Academic integrity as a teaching and learning issue: From theory to practice. *Theory into Practice*, *56*(2), 88-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1308173

Bertram Gallant, T., Binkin, N., & Donohue, M. (2015). Students at risk for being reported for cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *13*(3), 217-228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9235-5

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.

Bretag, T. (2019, April). Academic integrity and embracing diversity [paper presentation]. In *Pre-conference for the canadian symposium on academic integrity.* https://doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/36461

Bretag, T., & Mahmud, S. (2016). A conceptual framework for implementing exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 463-480). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_24

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*(2), 3-12. https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v7i2.759

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., … James, C. (2014). "teach us how to do it properly!" An Australian academic integrity student survey. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(7), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406

Centre for Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Academic integrity.* Western University. Retrieved May 23, 2024, from https://teaching.uwo.ca/teaching/assessing/academic-integrity.html

Chankova, M. (2020). Teaching academic integrity: The missing link. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *18*(2), 155-173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09356-y

Christensen Hughes, J. (2010). *Academic integrity review.* University of Windsor.

Dalal, N. (2015). Responding to plagiarism using reflective means. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, *11*(4), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-015-0002-6

Davis, M. (2022). Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional academic integrity policies, procedures, teaching and support. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *18*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00108-x

Dazeley, R., Goriss-Hunter, A., Meredith, G., Sellings, P., Firmin, S., Burke, J., & Panther, B. (2025). Agile Backward Design: A framework for planning higher education curriculum. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *52*, 1489-1508. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-024-00772-7

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.

Eaton, S. (2020, June 8). *Race-based data in student conduct: A call to action.* Werklund School of Education. https://prism.ucalgary.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/a4c486b9-a4ba-48d6-8171-deef320e1d2c/content

Equity and Inclusion Office. (2023, May). *Equity and inclusion glossary of terms.* University of British Columbia. https://equity.ubc.ca/resources/equity-inclusion-glossary-of-terms/

Grewal, M. (n.d.). *There are so many reasons why EDI is not the answer.* Times Higher Education. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/there-are-so-many-reasons-why-edi-not-answer

Head, G. W. (2024). Toward reflexive practice: Deconstructing academic integrity, EDI, and awareness training from an Indigenous perspective. In S. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (p. 1273-1286). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_136

Jamieson, M., & Mertiny, P. (2024). Academic integrity: A restorative justice approach in first year engineering. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA).* https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.2023.17149

Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor—implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 183–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262486

MacLeod, P. D., & Eaton, S. E. (2020). The paradox of faculty attitudes toward student violations of academic integrity. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *18*, 347-362. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09363-4

Maple League of Universities. (2022, March 16). *Ethical principles for university teaching: 25 years later [Video].* YouTube. https://youtu.be/SWV_J-WuV_4?

McCreary, M. (2022). Beyond backward design, or, by the end of this article, you should be able to imagine some alternatives to learning objectives. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, *41*(1). https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.454

McDermott, B. (2024). Enabling ableism: Using academic integrity arguments to create disability in testing environments. In S. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (p. 1169-1185). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_129

McNeill, L. (2022). Changing "hearts" and minds: Pedagogical and institutional practices to foster academic integrity. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (p. 487–503). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_25

McTighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2004). *Understanding by design: Professional development workbook*. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Mills, J., Wiley, C., & Williams, J. (2019). This is what learning looks like!": Backward design and the framework in first year writing. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *19*(1), 155-175. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0008

Morris, E. J. (2015). Academic integrity: A teaching and learning approach. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 1037–1053). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_11-1

Morris, E. J. (2023). Integrating academic integrity: An educational approach. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (p. 305-324). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_96-1

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* (p. 449–462). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_23

Moya, B. (2023, March 1). Students as Partners (SaP) in academic integrity (AI): Creating conditions for an AI SaP learning enviroment [Conference presentation]. University of Calgary. Calgary, AB. https://dx.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/40776

Office of Academic Integrity. (n.d.). *Diversionary process.* University of British Columbia. https://academicintegrity.ubc.ca/diversionary-process/

Openo, J. (2019). The international dimension of academic integrity: An integrative literature review. *Canadian Perspec-*

tives on Academic Integrity, *2*(2), 25-44. https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v2i2.68091

Penaluna, L.-A., & Ross, R. (2022). How to talk about academic integrity so students will listen: Addressing ethical decision-making using scenarios. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (p. 393–409). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_20

Petrina, S., & Ross, E. W. (2021). Higher racism: The case of the University of British Columbia— on the wrong side of history but right side of optics. *Workplace*, *32*, 12-25. https://ices.library.ubc.ca/index.php/workplace/article/view/186661

Rahimian, M. (2018). *Communications [Syllabus].* Mohawk College.

Rahimian, M. (2023). Aligning theoretical and practical considerations for academic integrity education: A Canadian perspective. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (p. 189-199). Springer International Handbooks of Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_137

Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, *44*(1), 5-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293

Sopcak, P., & Hood, K. (2022). Building a culture of restorative practice and restorative responses to academic misconduct. In S. E. Eaton & J. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (p. 553-571). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_29

Stoesz, B. M. (2024). Academic integrity through ethical teaching and assessment: Overview and current trends. In S. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (p. 203-216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_89

Stoesz, B. M., & Eaton, S. E. (2020). Academic integrity policies of publicly funded universities in Western Canada. *Educational Policy*, *36*(6), 1529-1548. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820983032

Suggested academic integrity statement. (n.d.). University of British Columbia. Retrieved 2024, April 30, from https://scs-senate-2021.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/ok_academic_integrity_statement.doc

University of Manitoba. (2016). *Cross-cultural education [Syllabus].*

van As, J., & Kluyts, M. (2023). Reimaging academic integrity through the lenses of ethics of care and restorative justice to establish a culture of academic integrity. In U. G. Singh, C. S. Nair, & W. Rashmi (Eds.), *Academic quality and integrity in the new higher education digital environment* (p. 23-54). Chandos Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95423-5.00003-X

Wolbring, G., & Nguyen, A. (2023). Equity/equality, diversity and inclusion, and other EDI phrases and EDI policy frameworks: A scoping review. *Trends in Higher Education*, *2*(1), 168-237. https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu2010011