From Policing to Partnership: Leveraging GenAI for Compassionate and Culturally Responsive Academic Integrity

Hebatallah Shoukry[1] , Gule Saman (s.gule@hw.ac.uk)[1], Nidhal Abdulaziz [1] and Clare Thomson[2]
[1]School of Engineering & Physical Sciences, [2] Learning and Teaching Academy, Heriot-Watt University

HERIOT WATT UNIVERSITY
UK | DUBAI | MALAYSIA

Overview: This poster presents a pilot study conducted with the Academic Misconduct Committee at Heriot-Watt University's School of Engineering and Physical Sciences. This work explores whether Generative AI can help committees make fairer, faster, and more empathetic decisions on academic misconduct, especially across culturally diverse student populations. Committee members reviewed hypothetical case studies alongside policy-informed GenAI recommendations, then rated GenAI as a potential collaborative partner across integrity, fairness, and inclusion. The findings point to human–AI collaboration as a promising route to more consistent, compassionate, and culturally aware misconduct decisions.

Methodology

A **case study–based survey** was conducted with **Academic Misconduct Committee members**. Participants reviewed **three anonymised academic misconduct scenarios**

1. GenAI-assisted coursework submission
2. Code generation misconduct
3. Unauthorised assessment aid

- For each case, respondents first made independent decisions regarding guilt and sanctions.
- They were then presented with policy-informed GenAI recommendations and completed Likert-scale evaluations

Quantitative analysis examined sanction patterns and levels of agreement with GenAI recommendations to evaluate the potential of human–AI collaboration in misconduct decision-making.

Results

Case Study	Guilty (%)	Void Assessment (%)	Void Course (%)	Cap Grade (%)	Warning (%)	Referral to UDC (%)
1	42.9	66.6	0	33.3	0	0
2	85.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	0	0
3	100	28.6	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3

Table 1. Distribution of guilty verdicts and recommended penalties

Key Findings

Empathy & Context: Human decision-making is valued for empathy and context, seen as mitigating systemic bias relative to GenAI.

Trust & Consistency: High consistency builds trust in GenAI; many support adoption to accelerate routine cases despite residual risk.

Cultural Fairness & Bias: Concerns persist over cultural fairness, data privacy, and bias amplification, human final authority remains essential.

References

1. B. Moya, S. E. Eaton, H. Pethrick, K. A. Hayden, R. Brennan, J. Wiens, B. McDermott, and J. Lesage, "Academic integrity and artificial intelligence in higher education contexts: A rapid scoping review protocol." Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, vol. *5, no.* 2, pp. 59-75, 2023.
2. C. K. Y. Chan, "A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning", International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 38, 2023. DOI:10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3
3. S. A. D. Popenici, and S. Kerr, "Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education", Springer Nature, 2024. DOI: 10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8