# COMPARISON OF INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN EUROPE AND EURASIA

Irene Glendinning[1]

[1] *Coventry University, United Kingdom*

## KEY WORDS

academic integrity strategy, policies and procedures, higher education, Europe, Eurasia

Publications about strategies and policies for academic integrity often refer to a "western" approach, but all the research on this topic confirms that there are great disparities in how academic integrity and academic conduct are perceived and managed, not just between countries, but often between higher education institutions within one country and sometimes across different parts of the same institution (Glendinning 2016; Foltýnek et al 2017; Tennant and Duggan 2008; Tennant and Rowell 2010).

The observed differences reflect varying perceptions about what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable academic conduct and practice. This also impacts on differences in how students are supported and guided, what and how sanctions are levied and decided, which, it turn influences how graduates perceive ethical and unethical conduct in their personal and professional lives. As access to higher education has expanded substantially over the last twenty years throughout the world, the role of higher education in shaping values of integrity and ethics in public and private life has never been more important.

In this workshop we will explore a range of different evidence about policies and procedures for managing student conduct in higher education institutions in Europe and Eurasia. The newly analysed data we will use as the basis for the workshop have been collected during the last decade during three research projects and most of the data used in this new study have not been published or presented before.

Few people would argue that maintaining fairness, proportionality and consistency, of both the experi-ence and the outcomes for students, is fundamental to the process of managing allegations of academic misconduct. The available evidence suggests that this basic requirement is not always achieved.

The outcomes for students are affected by whether the appropriate procedures ae followed, who makes the decision on whether to raise an allegation, who decides whether the evidence supports the allegation and how any sanctions are decided and the nature of the sanctions. If the required procedures are unduly onerous for academic staff or if the outcomes for students are seen as overly draconian, an academic may take the option of by-passing the formal procedures and imposing their own sanctions or ignoring the problem altogether. If due process is not followed, then there is the risk of a range of consequences, including: unfairness of outcomes, the student not receiving the necessary support and guidance, the student gaining from cheating, or having strong grounds to appeal against informal sanctions

An institutional strategy for academic integrity should include deterrence measures, training and education on good practice for both students and staff and, ideally, a holistic approach towards monitoring and enhancement of quality, standards and integrity. The research results show huge variations on whether, how and when this is achieved.

Participants will be asked to weigh advantages and disadvantages of different approaches, also drawing on their own experiences and factoring in different educational and political contexts. We will consider the range of threats to academic standards and

quality that we currently face, whether the learning takes place online, face to face or blended. To understand how to address these threats, we will examine evidence about the underlying reasons that drive students to breach rules for academic conduct and how these vary in different countries.

The ultimate aim of the workshop is to determine common characteristics shared by all effective and workable strategies, policies and procedures for building and maintaining academic integrity in higher education institutions.

An earlier version of this workshop, using just one set of data, was run by the author at the ICAI conference in Athens in September 2016.

# REFERENCES

Foltýnek, T., Dlabolová, D., Glendinning, I., Lancaster, T., and Linkeschová, D. (2017) *South East European Project on Policies for Academic Integrity*, Project report, commissioned by Council of Europe, April 2017. `http://www.plagiarism.cz/seeppai/Final-report_SEEPPAI.pdf`

Glendinning, I. (2016a) Book Chapter: European Perspectives of Academic Integrity in the *Handbook of Academic Integrity*, edited by Tracey Bretag, Springer Science + Business Media Singapore 2015. DOI `10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_3-2`.

Tennant, P. and Duggan, F. (2008), *Academic Misconduct Benchmarking Research Project: Part 2. The Recorded Incidence of Student Plagiarism and the Penalties Applied.* UK: The Higher Education Academy and JISC. `https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/academic-misconduct-benchmarking-research-project-part-2`

Tennant, P. and Rowell, G. (2010), *Benchmark Plagiarism Tariff for the Application of Penalties for Student Plagiarism and the Penalties Applied.* UK: Plagiarismadvice.org `https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/benchmark-plagiarism-tariff`