Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, *9*(4), 1-9
http://doi.org/10.55016/cpai.v9i4.84394
Practitioner article

OPEN ACCESS

Using generative AI to build discovery interview capacity: Lessons from a Canadian college

Josh Seeland*

Abstract
Training staff to conduct discovery interviews for potential academic misconduct can be challenging, particularly for institutions with limited numbers of experienced interviewers, geographically dispersed campuses, or growing demand for academic integrity support. To address this challenge, the author developed and piloted a generative artificial intelligence (GenAI)-supported discovery interview simulator designed to provide staff with opportunities to practise interview techniques, receive immediate feedback including alignment with policy and procedure, and build confidence in a safe learning environment. Rather than replacing traditional professional development, the simulator was intended to complement existing training by expanding opportunities for realistic, policy-aligned practice. Drawing on participant feedback and implementation experience, this article describes the simulator's development, lessons learned during its pilot use, and considerations for institutions interested in exploring similar approaches. Participants reported positive experiences with the simulations, particularly valuing the opportunity to practise realistic conversations, receive formative feedback, and engage in low-risk experiential learning. The pilot also highlighted the importance of aligning GenAI-supported training with institutional policies, refining scenarios through ongoing iteration, and integrating GenAI-based simulations with facilitated discussion and mentorship. This experience suggests that GenAI can serve as a practical tool for expanding institutional capacity for discovery interview training while maintaining human oversight and educational purpose. Recommendations are offered to help Canadian—and other—postsecondary institutions evaluate whether GenAI-supported simulations may be appropriate within their own academic integrity training programs.

Keywords
academic misconduct, Canada; ChatGPT, college, discovery interviews, generative AI, higher education, simulations in education, staff training

Assiniboine College
*__Corresponding author__: seelandjl@Assiniboine.net

The Challenge: Why Discovery Interview Training Needed A New Approach

Academic integrity is fundamental in higher education, and addressing academic misconduct requires effective training for staff in higher education institutions. This includes both proactive and reactive strategies: educating stakeholders on academic integrity and methods to prevent and reduce academic misconduct before it takes place paired with ways to identify potential academic misconduct and the administration of related policies.

Discovery interviews, sometimes referred to as academic integrity interviews, are structured conversations with students when concerns arise about the authenticity of students' academic work, normally once instructors identify irregularities or signals. They provide an opportunity for students to explain their work and for institutions to gather additional information before making decisions about potential academic misconduct. As Stoesz (2023) notes, discovery interviews are "necessary component for investigations of academic misconduct" (p. 62), but they are not intended to unilaterally determine guilt. Rather, they represent one source of information within a broader process guided by institutional procedures, policy, and administrative principles. At Assiniboine College, they are often informed by another service performed by the same library staff called bibliographic analysis, which is itself largely informed by the bibliographic forensics practices of Rogerson (2017) and Ellis et al. (2022).

Conducting effective discovery interviews requires considerably more than familiarity with academic integrity policies. Interviewers must know how to establish rapport, ask open questions, probe appropriately, remain neutral, and respond

professionally when students become emotional, defensive, or unable to explain aspects of their work. These skills develop through practice and constructive feedback rather than policy documents or one-time workshops. Stoesz (2023) similarly emphasizes that discovery interviews should be conducted only by appropriately trained staff and that opportunities for practice are an important part of developing interviewer competence.

At Assiniboine College, discovery interviews are conducted by two library staff, including the author, who play a central role in the institution's academic integrity practices. This approach builds on the academic library's institutional neutrality (Seeland & Openo, 2024) while drawing upon staff expertise in academic integrity education, policy, and procedure. Over several years, local guidelines for conducting discovery interviews were developed by adapting related published guidance (Murdoch & House, 2023; Stoesz, 2023; Curtis et al., n.d.; Eaton, 2019) to align with institutional policy and procedure, as well as the principles of administrative justice used institutionally. While this centralized model promoted consistency and quality, it also created a practical challenge. As the college expanded across multiple campuses and rural delivery sites, and as demand for academic integrity support increased, relying on a very small number of experienced interviewers became increasingly difficult to sustain.

Traditional professional development remained valuable but had practical limitations. Workshops could introduce concepts and institutional procedures, yet they offered limited opportunities for repeated practice in authentic situations. Role-playing with colleagues was useful but required significant staff time and coordination, often relied on volunteers with varying levels of experience, and could not easily replicate the wide range of student responses encountered during actual discovery interviews.

A subsequent revision to the college's academic integrity policy introduced another challenge. The updated policy empowered instructors to address lower-level academic misconduct incidents directly, reducing the need for every case to be referred centrally. While this change supported more timely and educational responses to academic misconduct, it also meant that a much larger group of staff now required the consistency, knowledge, and confidence necessary to conduct effective discovery interviews.

These policy changes coincided with the rapid emergence of GenAI in higher education and an increasing number of suspected cases involving its misuse. As instructors became responsible for addressing more lower-level academic misconduct incidents, they also faced new forms of evidence and increasingly complex conversations with students. Taken together, institutional growth, policy changes, and the evolving academic integrity landscape created an urgent need to expand discovery interview training. The challenge was not simply to train more people but to do so in a way that maintained consistency, fairness, and confidence across a growing and increasingly diverse group of interviewers.

Why GenAI Was Explored As A Tool

During this time, higher education was rapidly adapting to the emergence of GenAI. Much of the conversation focused on the implications of these technologies for academic misconduct, assessment, and teaching. Less attention, however, had been given to whether the same technologies might also strengthen institutional responses to academic integrity challenges.

These converging factors prompted a different question. Rather than asking whether GenAI could replace human trainers or automate discovery interviews, the question became if it could expand institutional training capacity by providing staff with realistic opportunities to practise, receive feedback, and build confidence before conducting interviews with students. The result was the development and pilot implementation of an AI-supported discovery interview simulator designed to complement, not replace, existing professional development practices.

The decision to explore GenAI was driven less by the technology itself than by the nature of discovery interview training. Unlike many forms of professional development that can be effectively delivered through presentations or written resources, discovery interviews require staff to develop practical communication skills through experience. Interviewers must respond to unpredictable conversations, adapt their questioning based on student responses, and apply institutional policies while maintaining neutrality, professionalism, and procedural fairness. These skills are difficult to develop without opportunities for repeated practice in situations that closely resemble authentic interactions.

The educational literature also suggests that conversational AI could support this type of experiential learning. Researchers have highlighted the ability of GenAI to personalize learning experiences, generate realistic scenarios, and facilitate conversation-based activities that adapt to individual learners (Atlas, 2023; Chang & Kidman, 2023; Currie, 2023; Mollick & Mollick, 2024; Scherr et al., 2023; Violato et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2023). Unlike traditional role-playing exercises, which depend on the availability of experienced facilitators and colleagues, a conversational simulator offered the potential for staff to practise repeatedly, explore different questioning strategies, and receive immediate and intentionally designed formative feedback in a psychologically safe environment. Participants could make mistakes, reflect on their approach, and refine their interviewing skills before applying them in conversations with students, where mistakes could result in false accusations or other serious negative consequences.

This approach also intentionally aligned with established principles of adult learning. Adults learn most effectively when

learning is directly relevant to their professional responsibilities, actively engages them in solving authentic problems, and provides opportunities for immediate application and reflection (Clapper, 2010; Knowles, 1980). Rather than simply explaining effective discovery interview techniques, a simulation-based approach allowed participants to experience the uncertainty and complexity of realistic interviews while receiving timely feedback to support continuous improvement.

Finally, the project reflected a broader commitment to developing AI literacy among postsecondary staff. As institutions continue to integrate GenAI into teaching, learning, and administrative processes, educators and support staff require opportunities to develop not only technical familiarity with these tools but also the judgment to use them responsibly and effectively (Chavez et al., 2023; Fathoni, 2023; Mohammadkarimi, 2023; Perkins, 2023; Quality Assurance Agency, 2023). The goal was therefore not to promote AI as a replacement for professional expertise but to explore whether it could serve as another educational tool: one that expanded access to consistent, authentic practice while keeping human judgment, institutional policy, and mentorship at the centre of discovery interview training.

Designing the Discovery Interview Simulator

The Discovery Interview Simulator was built by the author in 2023 using ChatGPT 4.0 and was designed to guide college staff through interactions as if they were speaking with a student thought to have engaged in academic misconduct. It facilitates specific questioning strategies and focuses on the irregularities provided in each of its generated scenarios. Design decisions were evaluated against one question: would this help participants develop the knowledge, judgment, and communication skills required to conduct fair, policy-aligned discovery interviews with students at Assiniboine College?

To achieve this, the simulator was designed using the College's existing academic integrity framework rather than generic conversation scenarios. Institutional policies, procedures, and established internal discovery interview practices provided the foundation for the learning experience, ensuring participants practised approaches consistent with local expectations and the principles of administrative justice. Rather than teaching interviewers to reach conclusions about misconduct, which is another step in the college's process, the simulator emphasized gathering relevant information through professional, neutral, and student-centred conversations.

To enhance realism and accurate variation, the simulator's anecdotal training data includes statistics related to student behaviours and emotional responses based on the author having performed many discovery interviews over several years. Training the simulator also involved avoiding generalizations about potential generated text based on limited testing results, encouraging the scenarios to include emotion, and providing many examples of desired text in the training data (Zamfirescu-Pereira et al., 2023). As recommended by Mollick & Mollick (2024), many iterations and experiments were done with the simulator before it was presented to the participants. Further, fictitious student names represent diverse genders and ethnicity, ensuring a broad range of realistic scenarios. The nature of GenAI as a tool to be evaluated (Craig, 2022) was evident in the design, development, and testing.

Realism was an important consideration. Participants needed opportunities to experience conversations that reflected the uncertainty and variability of actual discovery interviews at Assiniboine College. Students may respond with confidence, uncertainty, increased emotion, defensiveness, incomplete explanations, or unexpected questions, requiring interviewers to adapt while maintaining professionalism and neutrality. Rather than presenting identical conversations with predictable or static responses, the simulator was designed to expose participants to a range of realistic interactions that encouraged critical thinking and flexible communication. The objective was not to perfectly replicate every possible interview but to create authentic practice opportunities that required participants to apply sound interviewing principles in changing situations. Thus, each simulated scenario was unique from the beginning, and the user's actions made it more so as it developed. The simulator was also locked to focus exclusively on simulating discovery interviews and will not respond to inquiries about its creation or any topic unrelated to its purpose.

Equally important was the inclusion of meaningful feedback. The author's experience conducting discovery interviews suggested that practice alone was insufficient if participants were left to evaluate their own performance. The simulator therefore emphasized formative feedback intended to encourage reflection on questioning strategies, adherence to institutional practices, and opportunities for improvement. This reflected the broader educational philosophy underpinning the project: the simulator was intended to function as a learning tool rather than an assessment tool.

Following iterative development and internal refinement, the simulator was piloted with a group of 14 College employees across instructional, administrative, and student support roles. Participants reflected the diversity of staff who were either involved in different parts of the academic misconduct process or who were expected to be so as institutional capacity expanded. The pilot session combined hands-on interaction with the simulator, opportunities for discussion among participants, and structured opportunities to reflect on the experience.

Evaluation focused on the simulator's practical value rather than technical performance. Participants completed questionnaires before and after the pilot session to explore their previous experience with academic misconduct and GenAI, their confidence in conducting interviews, perceptions of the simulator, and suggestions for future improvement. Quantitative

responses were complemented by open-ended comments describing participants' experiences, allowing both measurable outcomes and practical insights to inform future refinement. This approach reflected the project's primary objective: determining whether a GenAI-supported simulator could provide a realistic, useful, and scalable addition to institutional discovery interview training.

What Was Learned

Although this project was originally evaluated through surveys and participant feedback, the most valuable outcomes extended beyond the usual measures. The pilot demonstrated that GenAI could provide meaningful opportunities for staff to practise discovery interviews in a low-risk environment while also highlighting several considerations for institutions exploring similar approaches. Five practical lessons emerged from the implementation.

Staff Valued Authentic Opportunities to Practise

Perhaps the clearest finding from the pilot was that participants valued the opportunity to engage in realistic discovery interview simulations before conducting interviews with students. Many described the experience as their first opportunity to practise interviewing skills in an environment that felt both authentic and consequence-free. Rather than discussing interview strategies in theory, participants were able to ask questions, respond to student explanations, and experience the natural uncertainty that accompanies real conversations.

Several participants commented that opportunities to "practice these skills," "work through some actual scenarios," and "play around with different scenarios and responses" were among the most valuable aspects of the training. Others observed that the simulator represented "probably the closest and most easily accessible way to build these skills" and would help staff new to discovery interviews become more comfortable with the process.

These responses reinforced an important principle of adult learning: professional confidence develops through experience as much as instruction. Discovery interviews require judgment, adaptability, and communication skills that are difficult to develop through policy documents or presentations alone. Providing opportunities to practise realistic conversations appeared to help bridge this gap.

Feedback Mattered as Much as Realism

While participants appreciated realistic conversations, many identified the feedback provided after each simulation as equally valuable. Participants frequently mentioned that constructive feedback helped reinforce effective questioning techniques while identifying opportunities for improvement. Comments such as "the feedback at the end of the scenario was most beneficial," "the positive feedback," and "the feedback that gave suggestions" highlighted the importance of reflection as part of the learning process.

Interestingly, participant suggestions for future improvement focused less on making the conversations more technologically sophisticated and more on strengthening the educational value of the feedback. Several participants recommended more detailed guidance, clearer explanations of interview objectives, and more opportunities to receive feedback across multiple scenarios.

This finding suggests that the educational value of GenAI-supported simulations depends not only on realistic conversations but also on structured opportunities for reflection. A convincing simulation may capture attention, but meaningful feedback appears to be what transforms the experience into learning.

Initial Skepticism Changed Quickly

Like many educators encountering GenAI for the first time, participants began the pilot with varying levels of familiarity and confidence. While some expressed curiosity and optimism, others admitted uncertainty about whether conversational AI could contribute meaningfully to professional development. A small number described their initial reaction simply as fear.

These reservations largely diminished following the pilot session. Participants consistently reported that the experience met or exceeded their expectations, with several commenting that they were "pleasantly surprised," "very impressed," or "quite surprised with how well it worked." Others noted that they entered the session with few expectations but left with a better understanding of both the technology and its potential application to discovery interview training.

As a means of helping to develop AI literacy, skepticism shifted toward constructive suggestions for improvement. Rather than questioning whether the simulator had value, participants focused on how additional scenarios, enhanced realism, or improved feedback could make future versions even more useful. This shift suggests that direct experience may be one of the most effective ways to help educators develop informed perspectives on the appropriate use of GenAI in professional learning.

AI Complemented Rather Than Replaced Professional Development

Another notable finding was that participants viewed the simulator as an addition to—not a replacement for—existing professional development. Throughout the pilot, discussions consistently emphasized the continued importance of workshops, mentoring, and conversations with experienced colleagues.

Participants valued opportunities to discuss scenarios with one another, compare interviewing approaches, and reflect collectively on challenging situations. These collaborative conversations complemented the individual simulation experience by allowing participants to consider alternative perspectives and learn from colleagues' experiences.

This finding aligns with the broader goal of the project. The simulator was never intended to replace experienced practitioners or institutional expertise. Instead, it functioned as another learning resource within a broader professional development program, providing opportunities for repeated practice while preserving the importance of human facilitation, institutional judgment, and collaborative reflection.

Confidence Improved

Participants also reported increased confidence in conducting discovery interviews following the pilot. Although confidence levels varied depending on previous experience, nearly every participant described feeling more prepared to apply discovery interview techniques after interacting with the simulator.

Rather than emphasizing detailed statistical comparisons, the overall trend was clear: participants left the pilot more confident than when they began. Satisfaction with the training experience was also high, and every participant indicated that the session at least met, if not exceeded, their expectations. Most reported that they would recommend similar training to colleagues and intended to incorporate what they had learned into future practice. An overview of findings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. General Perceptions of the GenAI Discovery Interview Training

Pilot outcome	Overall observation
Confidence	Increased following participation
Satisfaction	High across participant groups
Expectations	Met or exceeded for all participants
Most valued feature	Authentic practice opportunities
Most common recommendation	Additional scenarios and enhanced feedback
Role of AI	Complement to existing professional development

Taken together, these findings suggest that the simulator's greatest value was not the technology itself but the learning environment it created. Participants appreciated the opportunity to practise difficult conversations in a realistic but low-risk setting, receive timely feedback, and build confidence before conducting discovery interviews with students. While refinements were identified, particularly regarding scenario variety and feedback, the pilot demonstrated that GenAI could serve as a practical addition to institutional professional development by expanding access to consistent, authentic practice opportunities without replacing the human expertise that remains central to effective discovery interviewing. In many ways, the simulator became an extension of this human expertise since the training data and design were customized.

Practical Recommendations for Institutions

The experience developing and piloting a GenAI-supported discovery interview simulator reinforced that successful implementation depends as much on thoughtful educational design as the choice of technology. While every institution's academic integrity processes are different, several principles emerged that may help guide others considering similar initiatives.

1. Start with Institutional Policy, Not Technology

It can be tempting to begin by exploring the capabilities of and perhaps getting lost in GenAI. The most important design decisions were driven not by the technology but by the institution's existing academic integrity policies, procedures, anecdotes, and educational values.

Discovery interviews are conducted within local institutional contexts. Policies determine how concerns are investigated, the purpose of the interview, available student supports, documentation requirements, and decision-making processes. A training simulator should therefore reinforce these institutional expectations rather than generic interviewing techniques. Beginning with policy also helps ensure that the technology supports existing practice instead of unintentionally reshaping or distorting it.

2. Design for Coaching Rather Than Assessment

The simulator's primary purpose was to help participants learn, not to evaluate their competence. This distinction influenced the learning experience by encouraging experimentation, reflection, and continuous improvement without the pressure of overly formal assessment.

Participants appeared willing to explore different questioning approaches because they understood that mistakes were part of the learning process. This created opportunities for discussion about interviewing strategies that might not occur in higher-stakes training environments. Institutions considering similar approaches may therefore wish to position GenAI-supported simulations as coaching tools that complement professional development rather than mechanisms for certifying competence.

3. Prioritize Meaningful Feedback Over Perfect Realism

One of the more surprising lessons from the pilot was that participants consistently emphasized the value of feedback as much as the realism of the simulated conversations. While authentic interactions helped create engagement, it was the opportunity to reflect on questioning techniques, identify areas for improvement, and reinforce effective practices that participants described as most valuable.

This suggests that educational value depends less on creating a flawless simulation than on helping learners understand why particular approaches are effective. Institutions may therefore

achieve greater benefit by investing in thoughtful feedback and guided reflection than by striving for increasingly sophisticated simulations alone.

4. Blend GenAI with Human Facilitation

The simulator was never intended to replace workshops, mentoring, or conversations with experienced practitioners. Instead, it became most valuable when integrated into broader professional development activities. Participants benefited from discussing scenarios with colleagues, comparing interviewing approaches, and reflecting together on challenging situations.

GenAI can increase opportunities for individual practice, but experienced facilitators remain essential for interpreting institutional policy, sharing professional judgment, and helping staff navigate situations that extend beyond any simulation. The most effective learning seemed to occur when GenAI-supported practice and human discussion complemented one another rather than competing for attention.

5. Expect Continuous Refinement

Developing an educational simulation should be viewed as an ongoing process rather than a completed product. Participant feedback during the pilot identified opportunities to expand scenario variety, strengthen feedback, and increase realism in future iterations. These suggestions were not viewed as shortcomings but as part of the natural evolution of a learning resource.

GenAI technologies continue to change rapidly, as do institutional policies, academic misconduct trends, and staff learning needs. For this reason, institutions should anticipate regular review and refinement of both the simulator and the surrounding training program. Treating implementation as an iterative process helps ensure that the learning experience remains relevant, responsive, and aligned with institutional practice over time.

As a whole, these recommendations suggest that the long-term success of GenAI-supported discovery interview training may depend far more on educational design, institutional alignment, and ongoing evaluation than on the specific GenAI platform selected. Technology can expand opportunities for practice, but thoughtful design and implementation ultimately determine whether those opportunities become meaningful professional learning.

Questions to Consider Before Developing an AI-Based Discovery Interview Simulator

While there is no single blueprint that can simply be adopted elsewhere, institutions considering this type of initiative may benefit from reflecting on several questions before beginning development.

Institutional Readiness

A useful starting point is identifying the problem the simulator is intended to solve. Is the primary goal to increase the number of trained interviewers, improve consistency across departments, provide refresher training for experienced staff, or support a recent change in policy or procedure? Institutions should also consider who currently conducts discovery interviews, how new interviewers are prepared, and where the greatest challenges or bottlenecks exist. Clearly defining the educational need helps ensure that technology is introduced to address a genuine institutional challenge rather than because it is available.

Policy Alignment

Discovery interviews exist within institutional frameworks for academic integrity and administrative fairness. Any educational tool should therefore reinforce local expectations rather than generic interviewing approaches. Institutions may wish to consider which policies, procedures, and guidance documents should inform the learning experience and how consistency with existing practice will be maintained as policies evolve. Careful alignment with institutional expectations also helps ensure that participants develop habits and approaches that transfer directly into professional practice.

Educational Design

Technology alone does not create meaningful learning. Institutions should consider which interviewing skills participants most need to develop, how opportunities for practice will be structured, and what kinds of feedback will best support learning. Equally important is creating a psychologically safe environment in which participants can make mistakes, reflect on their performance, and build confidence before engaging in actual discovery interviews with students. These educational decisions are likely to have a greater influence on learning outcomes than the specific GenAI platform selected.

Implementation

Successful implementation also requires ongoing planning beyond the initial launch. Who will be responsible for maintaining the simulator as feedback is gathered and institutional policies and practices change? How will new scenarios be developed or existing ones refined? How will staff be introduced to the tool, and how will it be integrated with existing workshops, mentoring, or other professional development activities? Considering these questions early can help institutions view GenAI-supported simulations as part of a broader training strategy rather than a standalone initiative.

Evaluation

Finally, institutions should consider how they will determine whether the simulator is achieving its intended purpose. Measures of success might include increased staff confidence, fewer student appeals, greater consistency in discovery interview practice, participant satisfaction, or evidence that the training is supporting broader institutional goals. Just

as importantly, mechanisms should be established to gather participant feedback and use those insights to refine both the simulator and the surrounding professional development program over time.

Looking Ahead

Much of the discussion surrounding GenAI in higher education has focused on the challenges it presents for teaching, learning, assessment, and academic integrity. Those conversations remain important and will undoubtedly continue as GenAI technologies evolve. At the same time, this experience suggests that institutions should also consider how these same technologies might strengthen their capacity to respond to academic integrity concerns. Rather than viewing GenAI solely as a source of risk, academic integrity offices have an opportunity to explore how it can support education, staff development, and institutional resilience.

One promising application is simulation-based training. Creating sufficient opportunities for staff to practise the many skills involved in discovery interviews has long been a challenge, particularly for institutions with limited numbers of experienced interviewers or geographically distributed campuses. GenAI offers one way to increase access to realistic, repeatable practice while preserving the essential role of experienced practitioners in mentoring and supporting new interviewers.

The potential applications extend beyond discovery interviews. Similar approaches could be explored to support difficult conversations with students, academic integrity education, policy implementation, case management, or professional development for staff involved in academic appeals and investigations. While these possibilities will require thoughtful evaluation, the Discovery Interview Simulator suggests that simulation-based learning may become an increasingly valuable component of institutional academic integrity programs.

As GenAI technologies continue to advance, simulation-based training is also likely to evolve. Future systems may move beyond text-based conversations to include natural voice interaction, video-based role-playing, or multimodal simulations that more closely resemble in-person discovery interviews. Such developments could further enhance realism and accessibility, creating even richer opportunities for experiential learning. Regardless of the technology used, however, the educational principles underpinning effective training are unlikely to change. Authentic practice, meaningful feedback, institutional alignment, and opportunities for reflection will remain central to developing capable and confident interviewers.

Equally important is maintaining appropriate human oversight. Discovery interviews involve judgment, empathy, procedural fairness, and institutional context—qualities that cannot be delegated to technology. GenAI should therefore be viewed as an educational tool that supports professional learning rather than one that replaces human expertise or institutional decision-making. Experienced practitioners will continue to play a critical role in developing, interpreting, and implementing policy, as well as coaching staff, facilitating discussion, and ensuring that discovery interviews are conducted fairly and consistently.

Used thoughtfully, GenAI-supported simulations have the potential not only to expand access to high-quality training but also to help institutions prepare the next generation of academic integrity practitioners with greater confidence, consistency, and resilience.

References

Atlas, S. (2023). *ChatGPT for higher education and professional development: A guide to conversational AI.* University of Rhode Island. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cba_facpubs/548

Chang, C.-H., & Kidman, J. (2023). The rise of generative artificial intelligence (AI) language models: Challenges and opportunities for geographical and environmental education. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, *32*(2), 85-89. https://doi.org/10.1080/10382046.2023.2194036

Chavez, C. M. R., Troya, A. L. C., Cordero, C. R. Z., Orellana, L. M. G., Tapia, R. D. C., Aguila, O. E. P., & Gonzales, J. L. A. (2023). Impact of artificial intelligence in promoting academic integrity in education: A systematic review. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, *33*, 71-85.

Clapper, T. C. (2010). Beyond Knowles: What those conducting simulation need to know about adult learning theory. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, *6*(1), e7-e14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2009.07.003

Craig, C. J. (2022). The AI-copyright challenge: Tech-neutrality, authorship, and the public interest. In R. Abbott (Ed.), *Research handbook on intellectual property and artificial intelligence.* Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800881907

Currie, G. M. (2023). Academic integrity and artificial intelligence: Is ChatGPT hype, hero or heresy? *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*, *53*(5), 719-730. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2023.04.008

Curtis, G., Bretag, T., Slade, C., & McNeill, M. (n.d.). *Substantiating contract cheating: A guide for investigators*. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-10/substantiating-contract-cheating-guide-investigators.pdf

Eaton, S. E. (2019, September). *U have integrity: Educator resource how to lead a discovery interview about contract cheating.* University of Calgary. https://taylorinstitute.ucalgary.ca/resources/how-to-lead-discovery-interview-contract-cheating

Ellis, C., Rogerson, A., House, D., & Murdoch, K. (2022). (Im)possible to prove: Formalising academic judgement evidence in contract cheating cases using bibliographic forensics. In G. Curtis, J. Clare, K. Rundle, B. Stoesz, S. Eaton, & J. Seeland (Eds.), *Contract cheating: Causes, consequences, and prevention* (p. 185–198). Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12680-2_13

Fathoni, A. F. C. A. (2023). Leveraging generative AI solutions in art and design education: Bridging sustainable creativity and fostering academic integrity for innovative society. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *426*, Article 01102. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202342601102

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to androgogy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Books.

Mohammadkarimi, E. (2023). Teachers' reflections on academic dishonesty in EFL students' writings in the era of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *6*(2), 105-113. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.10

Mollick, E., & Mollick, L. (2024, June 12). *How to use AI to create role-play scenarios for your students, here's a sample prompt you can customize for your class.* Harvard Business Impact. https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/using-generative-ai-to-create-role-play-scenarios-forstudents

Murdoch, K., & House, D. (2023). Courageous conversations: Approaching amnesty through honesty as reparations to a learning community. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_181-1

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI Large Language Models in the postpandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *20*(2). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07

Quality Assurance Agency. (2023). *Maintaining quality and standards in the ChatGPT era: QAA advice on the opportunities and challenges posed by generative artificial intelligence.* https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/members/maintaining-quality-and-standards-inthe-chatgpt-era.pdf?sfvrsn=2408aa81_10

Rogerson, A. M. (2017). Detecting contract cheating in essay and report submissions: Process, patterns, clues, and conversations. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *13*(10). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-017-0021-6

Scherr, R., Halaseh, F. F., Spina, S., A. Andalib, & Rivera, R. (2023). ChatGPT interactive medical simulations for early clinical education: Case study. *JMIR medical education*, *8*, e49877. https://doi.org/10.2196/49877

Seeland, J., & Openo, J. (2024). Introduction: Academic integrity and the modern academic library. In J. Seeland & J. Openo (Eds.), *Academic integrity and the role of the academic library: Institutional examples and promising practices* (p. 1-15). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65731-3_1

Stoesz, B. M. (2023). Lies, lies, lies: Detecting deception and implications for investigations of academic cheating. In G. J. Curtis (Ed.), *Academic integrity in the social sciences: Perspectives on pedagogy and practice* (p. 53-68). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43292-7_4

Violato, E., Corbett, C., Rose, B., Rauschning, B., & Witschen, B. (2023). The effectiveness and efficiency of using ChatGPT for writing health care simulations. *International Journal of Healthcare Simulation*. https://doi.org/10.54531/wjgb5594

Xie, Y., Wu, S., & Chakravarty, S. (2023). AI meets AI: Artificial intelligence and academic integrity - a survey on mitigating AI-assisted cheating in computing education. In B. R. Y. Xie & H. Park (Eds.), *SIGITE '23: Proceedings of the 24th annual conference on information technology education* (p. 79-83). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3585059.3611449

Zamfirescu-Pereira, J. D., Wong, R. Y., Hartmann, B., & Yang, Q. (2023). Why Johnny can't prompt: How non-AI experts try (and fail) to design LLM prompts. In A. Schmidt et al. (Eds.), *CHI '23: Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems (Article 437).* Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581388

Open Access

Received
July 7, 2026

Accepted
September 30, 2026

Published online
October 21, 2026

Citation
Seeland, J. (2026). Using generative AI to build discovery interview capacity: Lessons from a Canadian college. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, 9*(4), 1-9. http://doi.org/10.55016/cpai.v9i4.84394

Copyright
©2026 Seeland. This open-access article is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY) terms. The use, distribution, or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided that the original author(s) and copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use,

distribution, or reproduction that does not comply with these terms is permitted.