ASCILITE 2024

Navigating the Terrain:

Emerging Frontiers in Learning Spaces, Pedagogies, and Technologies

Navigating integrity and innovation: Case studies of generative AI integration from an Arts Faculty

Josephine Hook, Andrew Junor, Cathy Sell, Carmen Sapsed
Monash University

As generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) continues to disrupt the way higher education is delivered, universities are responding at pace with strategies and resources to ensure responsible and ethical use of the technology by our students as they prepare for future professions. The integration of GenAI into teaching and learning activities is being diffused into educators' practice on a spectrum from caution through to positive educational transformation. In this paper, a team of educational designers in an Arts Faculty shares case studies and reflections from our educator colleagues to explore the uneven uptake of the technology. We argue that the focus on assessment security is blurring the potential of GenAI to create collaborative, exploratory and expansive learning experiences for our students. We suggest a programmatic approach to 'becoming' a graduate will allow space for educators to interrogate their teaching, learning and assessment activities to ensure our graduates can imagine themselves as professional selves in an uncertain future.

Keywords: Generative AI, education innovation, assessment design, assessment security, ethnographic case study

Introduction

Monash University has responded to the evolving challenges and opportunities of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) for the higher education sector with a strategic plan to incorporate responsible use of the technologies across our education, research and operational activities. A University Task Force on GenAI is pursuing multiple fronts to support the development of AI literacy and capability of staff and students as we transition toward integration of GenAI as a collaborative learning and teaching tool in alignment with the position of responsible use at Monash. The University recognises that "GenAI needs to be incorporated in higher education in order to prepare university students to be ethical human collaborators with the technology, both in academic practice and current and future professions" (Monash Submission to AI Inquiry, 2023). The Monash 'AI in Education Learning Circle', with representatives from each of our ten Faculties, is creating space for our educators and education professionals to explore the big questions which are emerging for the sector. AI bootcamps, faculty workshops, libraries of example learning activities and assessment tasks to scaffold the use of AI, AI tool guidance, and resources to support students' engagement with AI are being developed and delivered at pace.

In this paper, the Educational Design team in the Faculty of Arts reflects upon the experience of our educators engaging in the learn-test-share phase of integrating GenAI into learning, teaching and assessment. Our role is to lead, advise on and support education innovation in the faculty in line with the University's education vision. At the 'chalkface', we are experiencing an unsurprisingly slow 'diffusion' of GenAI into educators' practice, with educators on a dystopian-utopian spectrum from skepticism through to positive educational transformation (Bearman, 2022). While the imperative to respond to the technology is acute, the take-up is slow. In this paper we argue that the focus on the micro context of concerns about assessment security and integrity is blurring the macro context of the possibilities of collaborating with GenAI to create exploratory and expansive learning experiences for our students. We observe the influence that early adopters have on their more cautious colleagues. We suggest a programmatic approach to 'becoming' a graduate will allow space for educators to hold a multiplicity of views, and for students to imagine and articulate their professional selves.

We use an ethnographic, practice-based case study approach to collect and make sense of several sources of data, such as interviews, documents, observations, and artefacts from our colleagues' education practice (Yin, 2018). We situate this data in the context of colleagues' reflexive practice, to surface why they made certain decisions in the design and implementation of their learning innovations, the impact of their practice on learning, and implications for future practice. We locate our case study examples of educators' efforts to integrate GenAI into their education practice on the SAMR (substitution, augmentation, modification and redefinition) model, which describes a spectrum of digital transformation from enhancing existing tasks to creating new, previously inconceivable tasks (Hamilton et al, 2016). We draw upon Rogers' 'diffusion of innovations' theory as a framework to derive the different motivations behind educators' adoption of GenAI. This theory classifies five groups of innovation adopters, distributed on a bell-shaped spectrum according to their readiness to adopt the innovation: from innovators and early adopters through to laggards. (Rogers, 2003. The theory was first developed in 1962). For the purposes of this paper, we have chosen to replace the term 'laggards' with the term 'prudents', as we wish to emphasise the judicious, circumspect efforts of this group, rather than implying a sense of resistance. We invited a range of academics to respond to questions about their experience of designing and implementing AI activities and assessments, and we share some of these examples below.

The "assessment problem"

Traditional written assessment - and particularly, the academic essay - is a staple in humanities, arts and social sciences (HASS) disciplines as a reliable method of developing and testing students' research, critical analysis and argumentation skills. Text-matching software that checks a student's work against a database of works for 'similarity' is widely used as an educative tool to support students' demonstration of academic integrity in their work. Further, the practice supports educators to locate and address instances of plagiarism. AI as an assisted technology for writing has evolved beyond proofreading and editing tools to content generation. Without a failsafe method to identify AI-generated content, many educators are concerned about identifying an over-reliance or misuse of GenAI in student work (Perera & Lankathilaka, 2023).

In response to this concern some of our educators are asking, "how do I design GenAI out of my assessments?" Bearman et al (2022) describe a discourse of altering authority in the higher education literature about AI, where educators perceive GenAI as a threat to their authority and agency over their academic work. We have witnessed this with some of our academic colleagues wishing to return to in-class, hard-copy tests to retain control over academic security. These are the 'prudents' and 'late majority' in Rogers' 'diffusion of innovations' theory, regarding GenAI with caution and awaiting evidence of its successful integration by colleagues.

The first educator from our study, 'Alex', represents the next group on the diffusion scale, the pragmatic 'early majority'. Alex recognised that students would be aware of large language models (LLMs) and GenAI technology, and that AI literacy is an important 'generic' skill for all. Alex wished to demystify the technology, as well as 'level the playing field' for students. They introduced a class activity to explore uncertainty together with their students, prompting a GenAI tool with questions about the content, experimenting with tweaks to the prompts, critiquing the responses, and discussing the accuracy of GenAI responses and the academic integrity issues of using the tool. Alex wanted students to make an informed decision about leveraging LLMs or utilising GenAI in their final assessment, an independently designed research project of their choosing. They found that not a single student in a cohort of 80 chose to use the technology for the design or execution of their project, even though Alex had given the students express permission to do so. On reflection, Alex will continue to devote some class time to discussing the strengths and weaknesses of GenAI as a learning tool, even though students seemed 'bemused' by it. Overall, Alex did not find that GenAI was a useful tool in the context of the discipline, and concludes that rather, it is a 'distraction' to teaching the content (Participant A response, 2024).

Using GenAI to enhance conventional assessment practices

While educators such as Alex are testing the waters with GenAI, others are designing assessments which respond to the affordances of the technology by integrating alternative ways for students to engage in traditional research essay tasks. One of these affordances is in the ways that GenAI can be used as a tool for developing metacognitive skills through self-reflective practices (Hutson & Plate, 2023), particularly through the use of iterative writing practices (Smith & Nigel, 2024). 'Brodie' provides our next case study, representing the visionary 'early adopters' on the innovation diffusion scale. Brodie was aware of the limited relevance of their existing essay task to students' real life, as well as the ongoing challenge of plagiarism, and they were eager to try something different (Participant B response, 2024). Further, they felt the seemingly punitive institutional message to students about GenAI use was counterproductive to embracing potential learning opportunities with new tools. Brodie introduced an optional alternative to the existing essay task, inviting students to "ask GenAI to write their essay for them", then evaluate the GenAI response and undertake further research to write higher quality prompts for further GenAI output, elaborating on and editing the output for a final submission. Students submitted the essay with 'tracked changes' documenting the collaboration between the student and GenAI, and the student critique of the GenAI output, appended with a transcript of the prompts and outputs from the GenAI tool to confirm the student had interacted thoroughly and purposefully with the tool.

The affordances that generative AI tools have by their nature as an interactive medium, in essence allow students to capture and document their brainstorming and critical engagement with materials when used as part of the writing process. The practice of using GenAI as a medium for capturing the demonstration of critical skills shifts the focus of assessment to process over product (Swiecki et al, 2022; Smith & Nigel, 2024). The scaffolded and iterative nature of Brodie's task is notable, as critical application of GenAI technologies to written tasks is particularly suited to process-oriented writing that is centred around continuous evaluation, reflection, and iterative feedback. The educator provides feedback to students on their evaluation and refinement of the AI-generated output, as opposed to the accuracy and quality of the output of the tool, thereby objectively assessing the human contribution rather than the AI contribution to the final essay. Thus, rather than supporting claims of the death of the essay, Brodie's case study provides the opportunity to reconsider the very purpose of the essay as an educational format, allowing students and educators to recentre their focus on the process of posing and exploring research questions, and refining ideas, rather than accepting the written product as the only demonstration of learning.

Twenty percent of Brodie's students opted for the alternative, GenAI-collaboration version of the conventional research essay. These students reported high satisfaction with the task, and on average they all produced higher-quality work than those who opted for the conventional task. The students felt their AI literacy had improved, and there is a strong appetite for more tasks using GenAI in the future. Beyond the assessment task, Brodie reported that the class activities to introduce the task were successful in 'somewhat normalising' GenAI, and raising awareness of academic integrity concerns with GenAI 'making content up' with quotes from 'fake experts and fake research': in the context of this cultural studies subject, GenAI proved to be "extremely good at reproducing existing biases and generalisations, so it provided material absolutely ripe for exactly the kind of critique that we want students to perform". Brodie concluded, "Some lecturers have commented that by using GenAI in class we'd just be teaching students another way to cheat, but my experience was the opposite: I think we succeeded in scaring students off using GenAI uncritically and fostered a more open conversation about academic integrity". (Participant B response, 2024).

By cultivating a critical approach to emerging technologies, assessment that requires critique of AI-generated output both strengthens students' digital literacies and their understanding of GenAI capabilities and limitations from an accuracy and reliability perspective, which opens up conversations around academic integrity. In turn, this supports students in developing strategies for appropriate and ethical use of technology in their studies. While Brodie has expanded the potential learning outcomes of the essay task in their subject, this example represents a curriculum enhancement rather an extensive curriculum redefinition or modification (Lameras & Arnab, 2021). Brodie's approach aligns closely with their pre-established learning outcomes and

HASS educational traditions, in particular building on the enduring strengths of critical thinking and scholarly exploration which are central to research essay style assessments.

Using GenAI to transform education practices

Our third case study represents the technophile innovators on the innovation diffusion scale. These educators are considering "how can I leverage GenAI so my students' can identify their 'becoming' selves?" (Ajjawai et al, 2023). In HASS disciplines there is usually not a straight line from assessments to professional competencies. 'Cal' found that their students had difficulty articulating the skills they develop in HASS programs in a way that applies to professional core competencies. To bridge the gap between theory and practice, they investigated leveraging large language models (LLMs) to provide opportunities for students to 'imagine themselves as a professional' (Participant C response, 2024). Cal led a cross-faculty project team to develop a scalable platform for the simulation of professional experiences, named ATLAS (Applied Teaching Learning with Adaptive Simulacra; see Barker et al., 2024). This sophisticated platform, which builds on existing LLMs with a customised algorithm, has been implemented in a range of use cases across the University. Although each use case is different, they all use the same scalable platform to produce learning experiences with some common features: students have conversations via text or speech with artificial personas within a simulated professional environment, allowing rich, asynchronous practising of skills and knowledge. These simulated conversations are designed to complement rather than replace the existing unit curricula; typically providing another avenue for students to practise and receive formative feedback in preparation for an existing in-person or written assessment.

The example of the ATLAS platform raises questions about the roles of authenticity and relevance when creating professional simulations in HASS areas of study. Each implemented 'use case' for ATLAS involves a specific professional scenario with authentic roles played by learner and bot in a simulated conversation, and reinforcement of professional knowledge and quality standards. Many use cases are in STEM disciplines (e.g. health practitioner and patient having clinical conversations), or HASS disciplines with a clear vocational pathway (e.g. parent-teacher conference conversations in Education). Some HASS disciplines have professional scenarios and quality standards that are broadly relevant to all students, however, many Arts disciplines lack a standard vocational pathway, and hence lack professional scenarios that would be authentic for most students. This challenge is not specific to the ATLAS platform but aligns with established debates about the extent to which humanities disciplines should be positioned in relation to transferrable professional skills and career pathways (Klein & Walton, 2023; Gannaway & Sheppard, 2019). One available solution is to broaden the scope of professional simulation scenarios to ensure authenticity for a diverse range of learners in an Arts context, illustrated by the implementation of the ATLAS platform in Cal's Arts subject.

Cal's subject is a policy problem simulation for a multi-disciplinary cohort of Arts students. Cal facilitates an extended simulation over several weeks where student groups represent different stakeholders to manage a public health crisis. Rather than developing a conversation bot for a specific professional context, Cal used ATLAS to simulate a live social media environment during a crisis event, with a range of simulated personas responding to the event with authentic posts. Students assumed roles of personal relevance to respond to the crisis in teams with their individual disciplinary knowledge and skills. This demonstrates that authentic professional scenarios can be successfully simulated using GenAI in an Arts context in the absence of a single vocational frame, provided the scenario frame is designed appropriately to maintain relevance and authenticity for all student cohorts.

Of course, the level of individual and organisational capacity required to implement sophisticated educational innovations using generative AI, such as the ATLAS project, are prohibitive. Cal had the technical skills, knowledge and confidence to develop a sophisticated professional simulation platform, in collaboration with colleagues from across the university and supported by an innovation grant from the University's education academy. The successful implementation of the ATLAS platform has required what Mantai and Huber (2021) define as a 'networked teaching' approach to experiential learning at scale, in which educational responsibility

and innovation is collaboratively shared and encouraged by colleagues – in this case, between the technological platform experts of the ATLAS team, faculty-based Educational Designers, and subject content experts from a range of disciplines and faculties.

Cal is continuing to collect data on the project; however, he reports that student engagement with the simulation was high, with students reflecting on the quality of responses they received in the platform. Students who participated in the simulation generally received higher grades for their assessment task than those who did not, and students who were nervous about the assessment appreciated the opportunity to practise their communication strategies before submitting their task. Further, while the crisis simulation/stakeholder response has long been the teaching and learning approach in Cal's unit, the simulated social media environment has allowed them to manage engagement at scale, leveraging the new tools to do what they thought before was 'impossible' (Participant C response, 2024).

Despite the sophistication and initial development demands of custom AI platforms such as ATLAS, they can also enable low cost / high reward innovation when made available to colleagues across disciplines. In our final case study, 'Dana' reflects on the implementation of ATLAS in a creative discipline career development unit to introduce an explicit feedback literacy element to an existing assessment. The assessment requires students to produce a job or grant application that meets specific industry quality standards. In previous iterations of the task, Dana recognised that generating professional application materials could be a personally challenging exercise for students (Participant D response, 2024).

With help and advice from Cal, Dana introduced an AI feedback bot to help students interpret and integrate professional feedback without feeling their personal or creative identities were being criticised. With support from the Arts Educational Design team, Dana 'thickened' the task to incorporate a stage in which students sought and received feedback on their draft application from an AI recruiter. Built in the ATLAS platform, the AI recruiter was trained on the task instructions, rubric, and strategic documents from the key disciplinary governing body, and instructed to provide constructive feedback without rewriting the students' applications. Students were assessed on their critical evaluation of which AI feedback they chose to apply or reject to meet the expected quality standards (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023), based on explanatory mark-up annotations the students added to their final applications. Students sometimes disagreed with the AI feedback, or felt it didn't suit their learning preferences, but the overall student feedback was positive. The AI recruiter's feedback helped students to align their work with the task requirements, enabling the lecturer to provide higher-level feedback from an industry insider perspective. Dana was free to focus on more substantive feedback rather than structural issues the AI had already addressed: "The AI had already fed back to students on any structural gaps, such as, "you didn't use the STAR model", and I could attend to the individual with the specialist feedback that as a practitioner, only I could provide" (Participant D response, 2024).

Discussion

As we investigated data on our educators' use of GenAI in assessment activities for the University to respond to the Australian Government Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency request for information on the AI-readiness of our programs, we noted that in Arts most assessments (~90%; n=~1500) continue to prohibit all use of GenAI. The remaining ~10% is a mix of allowing GenAI with either no restrictions (~5%), or allowing GenAI with restrictions on the ways it can used, or on the tools allowed (~5%). (Note - these figures are a rough estimate only, drawn from a snapshot of LMS data entered by academics against each of their assessment tasks for Semesters 1 and 2, 2023, and Semester 1, 2024). These figures place the Arts faculty at the lower end of the scale in relation to other faculties in terms of supporting and guiding students to use GenAI in their learning.

Via our case studies, we can discern the rate of 'diffusion' of GenAI into education practice in our faculty. Perhaps we have a longer tail of cautious 'prudents' than Rogers' innovation diffusion theory suggests. Although the origins of AI in education extend back several decades, the more recent transition from research

to application in teaching and learning practice has brought into sharp focus the multiplicity of views about working with the technology, from the challenges of assessment security to the prospects for transformative learning experiences. The pragmatic 'early majority' educators, such as Alex, are seeking assurances about the security of the technology, and the relevance of GenAI for their own domain. They are pursuing opportunities to engage with the early adopters, and with us, to assess the effectiveness of the technology in their education practice. The visionary 'early adopters', such as Brodie and Dana, see the value of the technology for developing students' skills in conventional assessment tasks, in line with existing subject- and program-level outcomes. They are embracing opportunities for change, iterating on their practice, and influencing colleagues to adopt new practices. Tech-enthusiasts such as Cal represent the 'innovators'. Cal is pushing past the human/machine dichotomy to focus on developing their students' uniquely human collaborative and communication skills by working productively with AI and providing students with opportunities to think of themselves as professionals. Further, Cal is taking a programmatic view of assessment reform by recognising that certain skills, such as students' evaluative judgement, must be developed as a foundation early in a program, before students apply these skills in an activity such as the simulated social media platform. Finally, Cal is actively supporting colleagues to implement similar approaches in their teaching.

Educators need space to scaffold their own understanding of the context of AI use within their own discipline. As Bearman and Ajjawi (2023) argue, educators do not need to explain the 'black box' of AI, rather they should seek to orient their students to disciplinary quality standards for working with AI and provide meaningful interactions with AI systems. Existing studies on student perceptions of AI suggest that students have a positive attitude towards AI, and they generally perceive AI use as a highly relevant skill to their future studies and careers (Chan & Hu 2023). Nevertheless, studies also find that students have concerns regarding plagiarism, data privacy and ethical issues, output accuracy, financial costs, and unclear institutional expectations (Chan & Hu 2023; Arowosegbe et al., 2024). Familiarity with new technologies relates strongly to comfort levels, and there is a positive correlation between students' willingness to use GenAI, their knowledge of GenAI and understanding of its limitations, and frequency of use (Chan & Hu, 2023), which suggests that well-supported classroom activities and staged tasks such as the examples discussed in this paper have the potential to increase student engagement and skills through appropriate scaffolding.

Conclusion

Our role as Educational Designers is to build the capacity of our educators, reinforce their identity as educators and experts in their field, and encourage them to harness their disciplinary expertise to invent new teaching, learning and assessment activities. While our case study examples represent the education practice of a small number of academics, they demonstrate the gamut of the SAMR model applied to digital practice, incorporating GenAI to enhance existing tasks, through to significant task redesign and the creation of new tasks to transform learning and teaching practice. To expand the conversation beyond the academic security concern, and shift educators' practice into the transformative, we are working towards a faculty-wide programmatic approach to integrating GenAI. Strategically, this is ideally located within the existing course review and accreditation process. Here educators come together with colleagues in their disciplinary teams to consider what 'becoming' a graduate looks like in their discipline, and it is a precious opportunity to interrogate current program learning outcomes for connection and alignment to what our students value. GenAI has surfaced a long-standing effort to ensure HASS graduates are equipped for an uncertain future, and it may be the catalyst for a radical shift in the way we design our teaching, learning and assessment experiences.

Acknowledgements

We owe huge thanks to our colleagues at Monash University, Associate Professor Ari Seligmann and Associate Professor Tim Fawns from the Monash Education Academy, and Dr Joel Moore from the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Education, for providing a range of opportunities and resources to help us think through the

implications, opportunities and challenges of generative AI in our practice. Many of the ideas in this paper were sparked in workshops and conversations facilitated by Ari, Tim and Joel.

Notes on ethics statement and survey responses

This research has ethics approval from Monash University. All responses have been de-identified, with a pseudonym attached to each case for ease of reference.

References

Ajjawi, R., Tai, J., Dollinger, M., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Bearman, M. (2024). From authentic assessment to authenticity in assessment: broadening perspectives. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(4), 499–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2271193

Arowosegbe, A., Alqahtani, J. S., & Oyelade, T. (2024). *Students' perception of generative AI use for academic purpose in UK Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.20944/PREPRINTS202405.1158.V1

Barker, L. A., Moore, J. D., & Cook, H. A. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence as a Tool for Teaching Communication in Nutrition and Dietetics Education-A Novel Education Innovation. *Nutrients*, *16*(7), 914-. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu16070914

Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2022). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: a critical literature review. *Higher Education, 86*(2), 369–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2

Bearman, M., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Learning to work with the black box: Pedagogy for a world with artificial intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(5), 1160–1173. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13337

Bearman, M., Nieminen, J. H., & Ajjawi, R. (2023b). Designing assessment in a digital world: an organising framework. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 291–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2069674

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Gannaway, D., & Sheppard, K. (2019). Pursuing employability through generalist and specialist degree programs: Australian perspectives. In *Education for Employability (Volume 2)*, 155-166. Brill.

Hamilton, E. R., Rosenberg, J. M., & Akcaoglu, M. (2016). The Substitution Augmentation Modification Redefinition (SAMR) Model: a Critical Review and Suggestions for its Use. *TechTrends*, *60*(5), 433–441. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0091-y

Hutson, J., & Plate, D. (2023). Working with (not against) the technology: GPT3 and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in college composition. *Journal of Robotics and Automation Research, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.33140/jrar.04.01.02

Klein, E., & Walton, J. (2024). Mapping future work skills in the bachelor of arts: findings from an Australian study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *43*(1), 104–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2228218

Lameras, P., & Arnab, S. (2021). Power to the Teachers: An Exploratory Review on Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Information, 13*(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.3390/info13010014

Mantai, L., & Huber, E. (2021). Networked teaching: Overcoming the barriers to teaching experiential learning in large classes. *Journal of Management Education, 45*(5), 715-738. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562920984506

Monash University Submission to AI in Education Parliamentary Inquiry, DVCE Portfolio, 12 July 2023. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/DocumentStore.ashx?id=98d34f1a-1f3b-4ee1-a742-f57076f924c8&subId=745132 on 12 June 2024.

Participant responses A, B, C, and D. (2024). Unpublished raw data from Research Project, Evaluating the effectiveness of education innovation, ID 30268. Lead investigator Josephine Hook. Monash University.

Perera, P., & Lankathilaka, M. (2023). AI in Higher Education: A Literature Review of ChatGPT and Guidelines for Responsible Implementation. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, VII*(VI), 306–314. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7623

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations, 5th Edition* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Smith, D., & Francis, N. (2024). Process not product in the written assessment. In S. Beckingham, J. Lawrence, S. Powell, & P. Hartley (Eds.), *Using Generative AI Effectively in Higher Education: Sustainable and Ethical Practices for Learning, Teaching and Assessment* (pp. 115–126). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003482918-17

Swiecki, Z., Khosravi, H., Chen, G., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Lodge, J. M., Milligan, S., Selwyn, N., & Gašević, D. (2022). Assessment in the age of artificial intelligence. *Computers and Education. Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100075-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications : design and methods* (Sixth edition.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Hook, J., Junor, A., Sell, C., & Sapsed, C. (2024). Navigating integrity and innovation: Case studies of generative AI integration from an Arts Faculty. In Cochrane, T., Narayan, V., Bone, E., Deneen, C., Saligari, M., Tregloan, K., Vanderburg, R. (Eds.), *Navigating the Terrain: Emerging frontiers in learning spaces, pedagogies, and technologies*. Proceedings ASCILITE 2024. Melbourne (pp. 165-172). https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2024.1234