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Workshop Structure, including your input

- Examples of good practice across the EU
- Impediments to change
- Known unknowns, unknown unknowns
- Management of change
- CMMI
- Academic Integrity Maturity Model
- Where to go next?
Examples of good practice across EU

- Ten years of research in UK;
- Holistic approach “Oxford Brookes Model”;
- Focus on prevention measures, designing out plagiarism;
- Using digital tools for detection and formatively;
- AMBeR Project – standard tariff for plagiarism;
- Development of digital corpus of doctoral and master’s theses in Lithuania, Slovakia, Poland;
- Pockets of researchers supporting others, eg Finland, Ireland, Germany, Bulgaria, UK;
- Mobile phone app to prompt students on milestones, approaching deadlines;
- National initiatives to highlight the problem, France (Mazodier et al 2012);
- Statistics and annual reporting, eg Austria, Sweden
- HEA Policy Works, QAA Audits, OIA poor & good case studies
- Specialist support units for academic integrity, academic writing;
- Pre-university guidance and support.
Impediments to change

Deciding where to begin in countries and higher education institutions where:

• No policies and procedures for plagiarism and academic dishonesty are implemented at present;
• There is no appreciation of the scale and nature of student plagiarism;
• There is a strong culture of academic autonomy;
• Staff development is unheard of;
• Whistle-blowers on plagiarism are seen as undesirables;
• The concept of plagiarism prevention or avoidance is not understood;
• Accountability for decisions on student assessment is weak or absent;
• High academic staff workload, tight deadlines, other commitments, second jobs;
• Underinvestment in Higher Education infrastructure, resources;
• Any more?
Known unknowns, Unknown unknowns

• How much plagiarism existed before the Internet?
• How much plagiarism, academic misconduct goes undetected?
• Is plagiarism increasing or not?
• Why are there national differences?
• What’s the next big challenge?
Management of Change

Considering great differences identifies It would be useful to have in institutions and countries

• A way to classify, categorise maturity of policies and processes
• Staged guidance on how to develop and improve
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability Level</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Key Process Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Optimising</td>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Process change management; Technology change management; Defect Prevention; Causal Analysis and Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Quantitatively Managed</td>
<td>Product &amp; process quality</td>
<td>Quality Management; Quantitative Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Defined</td>
<td>Engineering process</td>
<td>Organisation Process Focus; peer review; training; Product engineering;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Managed</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Requirements Management; Project Planning, tracking; QA; Sub-contractor management; Configuration Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Performed</td>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>No Key Process Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic Integrity Maturity Model (National, Institutional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity Level / Culture (Capability Level / Focus)</th>
<th>Established systems (Key Process Areas)</th>
<th>Areas for development</th>
<th>Metrics, indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Self-regulating, communicating, harmony</td>
<td>No systematic guidance for students, staff, policy, systems, QA, etc</td>
<td>Explore options, policy Review QA Senior staff engagement Create guidelines</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Awareness of need for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Individual autonomy, complacency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Comatose, head in the sand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Capability Maturity Model Infrastructure (CMMI) Carnegie Mellon University
Where to go next?

• Thanks for your input to this workshop
• Model to be developed and applied to EU nationally as output from IPPHEAE
• Model(s) available for self-assessment, nationally, institutionally
• Journal paper
• Further feedback very welcome
Thank you!

Questions?
ireneg@coventry.ac.uk
ippheae.ec@coventry.ac.uk
http://ippheae.eu
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